

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CCXIII.]

SEPTEMBER, 1823.

[Vol. XVIII.]

Mr. S. Freeman on the Prophecies of Isaiah, ch. vii.

Enfield,
June, 1823.

SIR,
IN the year 1788, at which time I was settled with a congregation of Protestant Dissenters at Honiton, in Devonshire, as their minister, a discourse by the late Dr. Blayney, the learned translator of Jeremiah, on the sign given to Ahaz, Isaiah vii. 14—16, fell into my hands. I was just about that time, or had just before been, engaged in drawing up for my own use a chronology of the Old Testament history, so far as that alone would carry me. In the prosecution of this design I had been minutely comparing many passages of the prophets with others in the direct historical books. My mind being then full of the subject, I was dissatisfied with several things which were advanced in the Doctor's discourse, and penned for my own satisfaction the following piece, containing observations on those parts of the Doctor's sermon to which I felt objections. I was, as will be seen, not pleased with the double sense of prophecy, and in relation to that had prefixed to my essay a quotation from Cicero, "*Veritatis cultores, fraudis inimici;*" thinking that the double sense savoured too much of the ambiguity of the old heathen oracles, and tended but too plainly to sink the dignity of the former to a level with the baseness and duplicity of the latter. If a performance that has lain by me unnoticed for 35 years is worthy of your attention, and suitable to the purposes of your instructive miscellany, it is at your service.

STEPHEN FREEMAN.

On the Prophecies of Isaiah, ch. vii.

Previous to the immediate consideration of the prophecy itself, and as introductory to it, it may not be useless to take notice of the state of public affairs at this time, and to give a brief historical detail of the events then taking place in Judah and Israel.

These had now subsisted as separate kingdoms above two hundred years.

Of the latter, Pekah, son of Remaliah, was now king; and, in the 17th year of his reign, Ahaz, son of Jotham, succeeded his father as king of Judah. This latter had for some time past been governed by kings who, in the main, did that which was right in the sight of the Lord; but who, nevertheless, did not exert themselves to destroy the high places on which the people used, contrary to their law, (as being nearer in their apprehension to heaven, the habitation of their divinities,) to offer sacrifice and burn incense to the hosts of heaven. It may be reasonably supposed that, on this account, towards the close of the reign of Jotham, (see 2 Kings xv. 37,) the Lord began to send against Judah, Rezin, the king of Syria, and Pekah, Remaliah's son, king of Israel. Such was the situation of affairs when Ahaz came to the throne of Judah.

Not alarmed at this appearance of things, nor incited by it to turn unto the Lord and serve him wholly, he did worse than his fathers; he walked in the ways of the kings of Israel, and made molten images for Baalim (2 Chron. xxviii. 2—4). Then Rezin and Pekah having made all necessary preparations, came up to Jerusalem to make war against it. They besieged it, and routed the army of Ahaz more than once; but they could not overcome him so as to bring him into subjection, or render him tributary to them (2 Kings xvi. 5, 6, &c. 2 Chron. xxviii. 5—15, and Isaiah vii. 1). That Judah might be brought very low, because of Ahaz the king, who transgressed sore against the Lord, other enemies were brought up against this people; the Edomites and Philistines invaded the country, and carried away captives (2 Chron. xxviii. 16—19). In the midst of his distress, instead of turning to the God of his fathers and seeking succour from him, Ahaz sent unto the king of Assyria to help him. And to induce Tiglath-pileser to come to his assistance, he humbly calls himself his servant and son, and sends

him a magnificent present of the silver and gold which he found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasures of the king's house (2 Kings xvi. 7, 8). God is always gracious, patient and long-suffering. He is willing, before Ahaz absolutely and entirely casts him off, by trusting in princes instead of Jehovah, in an arm of flesh instead of the Most High, to try him, by clearly manifesting mercy and love in the midst of deserved judgment. Hence, when Ahaz is alarmed at the tidings that Syria and Israel are confederate against him, God sends the prophet Isaiah to give him comfort, and console him with the assurance, that though Syria and Israel had taken counsel against him, yet it should not stand, neither should it come to pass (Isa. vii. 2, 3, 5, 7—9). "The head of Syria is Damascus, and the head of Damascus is Rezin; the head of Ephraim (or Israel) is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is Remaliah's son (Pekah). Within threescore and five years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people." Such are the tidings of comfort which Isaiah the prophet brought from the Lord to Ahaz the king—tidings which, had he believed in God, would have allayed his fears and filled his heart with confidence and joy.

To this it is added, "If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established"—an intimation this to Ahaz, that though such as is mentioned in the 16th verse would be the fate of Samaria and Pekah and Rezin, yet he must not thence indulge a confidence, and rejoice in the expectation that he and his posterity would therefore be secure in possession of the crown and kingdom of Judah. For though he would be saved from the hands of his present enemies, yet unless he believed in the Lord, and turned his heart towards him, neither should he be established: his security and confidence would be then of only short duration. In a little time the Lord would bring against him other enemies who should woefully harass him, and who shall finally bring him into subjection, reduce his kingdom under their dominion, efface all its glory, and carry away the whole strength of the nation captives into a far country.

Thus far Jews and Christians are all generally agreed in their interpre-

tation of the prophecy, and as to the meaning of what the prophet had declared. The variety of opinion and difference of interpretation arise from what follows from the 10th to the 16th verse inclusive. But the chief difficulty lies in the 14th, 15th and 16th verses. There is a general agreement with respect to the explanation of the others, except so far as that interpretation may be affected by the meaning given to the three verses just mentioned.

"Moreover the Lord spake again unto Ahaz," or as it is in the margin, and literally translated from the Hebrew, And the Lord added to speak unto Ahaz; he, at that time, after having mentioned what occurs in the preceding verses, continued to speak unto Ahaz, saying, as it there follows; or, if it was at another time, it was nevertheless relating to the same things on which he had already spoken to him, or to such as were in some way immediately connected with them—"Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God," which it was then usual for men to ask and for God to grant, in confirmation of what had been declared by the mouth of the prophet; "ask it either in the depth or in the height above," you are at liberty to choose the sign from any thing on earth, or any thing in heaven, according to what you may deem most convincing and satisfactory to your own mind.

"But Ahaz said, I will not ask for a sign, neither will I tempt the Lord." Not that he hearkened and readily believed, without any such sign, what God had declared, and, therefore, did not need one for the confirmation of his faith, did he refuse to choose a sign; but because he was an idolater, walking in the ways of the kings of Israel, and his heart being alienated from Jehovah he hardened himself in his iniquity, and refused to turn to the Lord, and give ear to his words by the mouth of the prophet.

"And he," the Lord, or rather the prophet by the command of the Lord, (for it is said, "my God,") said, "Hear ye now, O house of David," of which family was Ahaz, hearken thou descendant of David unto my words. "Is it a small thing for you to weary men," by despising what they say, and ill treating them for speaking the truth; "but will you

weary my God also," who has now spoken unto you by my mouth, and whose words you will not hear, but condemn? "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign:" though you are so perverse and obstinate in your rebellion against God that you will not believe what he says, nor desire a sign, when he calls on you to do so, for the confirmation of your faith; yet so gracious and patient is he towards you, that he will himself nevertheless give you a sign, peradventure when you see the fulfilment of one declaration, you may be induced to believe the other also, and thus shall you save yourself and all your house. "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, when he shall know to refuse the evil, and shall choose the good. For before this child shall know to refuse the evil, and to choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings. But the Lord shall bring upon thee, and upon thy people," &c. "days that have not come," &c.

Before I proceed to state what appears to me the natural and most consistent interpretation of this prophecy, it may not be amiss to notice some other methods which the learned have adopted in explaining it, and to mention the objections which appear to lie against them.

It is a commonly received opinion that this prophecy relates to the birth of our Saviour, and this opinion seems to have been much favoured, if it did not even originate in the application made of this prophecy to the birth of our Saviour, in the beginning of the Evangelist Matthew. Hence it has met with many and strenuous supporters, who in various ways have defended their cause.

1. It is supposed by Dr. Kennicott that the 14th and 15th verses contain a prophecy concerning our Saviour, and that the child spoken of in the 16th verse is Shear-jashub, the son of the prophet, who went with his father by the command of the Lord to meet Ahaz; see ver. 3. On what Dr. Kennicott founded this opinion I know not, not having had an opportunity of reading his sermon on this passage. But, as Dr. Blayney observes, it seems more natural to conclude from the

connexion of the discourse, particularly from the striking expression of knowing "to refuse the evil and choose the good," that the same child is here spoken of that was before introduced to our notice. See his Sermon, p. 5, note.

1. If it be asked, in defence of Dr. K.'s supposition, for what reason should Isaiah's son go with him, since without that supposition his presence seems to have been quite unnecessary, it may be replied, that for aught that appears to the contrary, the prophet's son knew already to refuse the evil and to choose the good; and then the sign could not apply to him or he be the sign referred to in the prophecy. And that he was already sufficiently old for this, there is at least as much reason to suppose as the contrary. It is not said that the prophet should take or carry this child with him. But he and his son are commanded to go forth to meet Ahaz. And then, if we suppose him of such an age as to accompany his father, he might go with him, because he was training up to speak in the name of the Lord.

2. According to Dr. K.'s supposition again, the sign promised to Ahaz could not refer to the birth of the child, spoken of in verses 14, 15; but to the event mentioned in the 16th verse, that before Shear-jashub should know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land of Syria and of Israel which Ahaz abhorred, should be left desolate of both their kings. The question will then return respecting the 14th and 15th verses, What was the design of introducing the prediction of such an event at this time? The only plausible reason which occurs is this: the Deity would hereby intend to place the certainty of the event predicted to Ahaz, on the same evidence or ground of belief with all the predictions and promises given to the children of Israel as a peculiar and favoured people, and especially with those which referred to the Messiah repeatedly promised throughout the history of this people. Thus he would direct the attention of Ahaz to those various prophecies and promises which he had given in favour of that people, and in relation to those events leading on to that most important one of all, the coming of the Messiah, which

had been then already fulfilled or were then coming to pass. From the fulfilment of past promises and prophecies, that of those not yet accomplished, and then being given, might be justly expected; and with abundant reason might Ahaz therefore confide in what God had now declared to him in the 7th, 8th and 9th verses.

But to this it may be replied, that we may very justly question, even if we are not fully assured, that Ahaz would not understand this prophecy as referring to the Messiah; and what impression could a reference to such an event predicted, be expected to make on a mind so estranged from God as was that of Ahaz? The birth of the Messiah had never before been spoken of in such a manner, nor is there any thing in the connexion of the prophecy which should direct the attention to that event. And if the design of the Deity in delivering this prophecy had been such as was just mentioned, it is very reasonable to suppose that he would have spoken of that event in such a manner, as should infallibly direct the attention of Ahaz to it, and prevent his mistaking that reference, when we consider that this is supposed to be a testimonial that the prophecy of an event in which he was concerned, should certainly come to pass.

But farther, it seems not very consistent with the wisdom of the Deity, to suppose him making use of such means to gain the attention and faith of such a character as Ahaz was, in what he might say. Ahaz totally contemned the God of his fathers, and paid no regard to what had been actually done and promised to be done by the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. He had no faith, he gave no credit to any of these things. To what purpose then, would it be to call his attention, especially in so obscure and ambiguous a manner as it must have been in this instance, to the recollection and consideration of such things, in order to confirm his faith in what the Lord now declared? It should seem altogether inconceivable and in vain. It would be unsuitable and consequently ineffectual to the intended purpose.

It was said that the sign promised to Ahaz could not on Dr. K.'s supposition be the birth of the child spoken

of in the 14th and 15th verses. For this would involve in it the absurdity so often objected on this passage, that the event whose prediction was to be confirmed, would precede that which was predicted in confirmation of it by several hundred years. The absurdity of which is too palpable to need any illustration with a thinking mind, and to others it would be of no effect to illustrate it. Such as wish to see this clearly set forth, may consult Postlethwaite's Discourse on this passage, Part 1st, as referred to by Dr. Blayney. It may not, however, be irrelevant to make a few general observations here on this subject.

The purpose to be answered by a sign in such cases was, to confirm the faith of the person to whom such a sign was given, and to establish the credit of the prophet by whom the promise was given or the prediction was foretold. The sign ought therefore, in the nature of it, to be adapted more immediately to strike the attention, more clearly to enlighten the mind and convince the judgment. The sign given will accordingly be always found to have been something which exhibited full proof and afforded clear evidence to the person addressed, that he who could do, or foresee what constituted the sign, must also be capable of doing or foreseeing *that*, for the confirmation of the promise or prediction of which the sign had been given; and that therefore the prophet was deserving of full credit. But how this could be accomplished by constituting as a sign of the certainty of a future event, the prediction of another future, more distant and more astonishing event, it will be difficult to shew, and it is impossible to conceive. It is more distant in futurity, therefore less likely to be foreknown: it is more remarkable in its nature, therefore less likely to gain credit. Nor is there any higher authority or superior ability manifested in the one case than in the other. If Ahaz did not believe in the former prediction of events regarding himself and his family, it is not possible that such a sign should convince him or so impress his mind as to assure his faith. The same principles which influenced him to discredit the first prediction, would induce him to

reject the second given as the sign, there being not any more, yea rather much less reason why he should admit the latter than confide in the former. But when, in confirmation of any thing predicted, another event which at the time appears very improbable, is foretold and is seen actually to take place according to all the circumstances of the prophecy, proof is given of the ability of the person predicting to foresee; the attention of the person to whom the prediction is addressed is arrested, and strong, irresistible evidence is set before him that the other event foretold will assuredly come to pass.

II. In order to escape the charge of absurdity arising out of the former supposition of Dr. Kennicott's, Dr. Blayney proposes, while he still refers this prophecy to Christ, a new mode of interpreting the sign given to Ahaz. The prediction contained in the 14th and 15th verses according to Dr. B. is not the *sign* of the event foretold in the 17th to the 25th verses, but is the *event* of the accomplishment of which his latter prophecy, and that contained in the 16th verse, are the sign. The sign therefore, cannot be given to confirm Ahaz in the belief of what is said in the 7th, 8th and 9th verses, but to confirm the Judaites of that time, and the Jews of all succeeding ages, in the belief and expectation of the Messias.

In vindication of this interpretation Dr. B. says, (Sermon, p. 6,) "It can hardly be supposed that God who was justly offended at the impious distrust of Ahaz, would make any fresh effort to conquer his fears, or soothe him with further hopes of deliverance." But is not the whole history of the Jewish nation, and of the divine dispensations to mankind, a proof that God does act towards sinners with such patience, long-suffering and mercy? Then, why can it be hardly supposed that he should act thus in the present instance towards a king of the royal race of David, especially if, in addressing the king, we suppose him to address the people at large?

Dr. B. proceeds: "The reproof that followed upon his refusal of the sign offered him, instead of comfort, breathes only a design to punish." True, here is a reproof and remonstrance with him for his contempt of

the Lord. And if it breathes a design to punish, it is in perfect harmony with what is said in the 9th verse, "If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established." So in the 13th verse, if he continued perverse, and would not hearken nor believe the Lord, he would weary out the patience not only of men but of God also, and would then meet with that punishment which is predicted in the close of the chapter. There seems no reason to suppose that it breathed only a design to punish, except conditionally, on the ground of Ahaz persisting in his unbelief and sin. This is the usual mode of the divine dispensations.

I. But it seems that forcible objections may be made against this whole method of interpreting these prophecies. The connexion and scope of the context seem to oppose it. The Lord continuing still to speak unto Ahaz, calls on him to ask for a sign. Now a sign of what can we suppose that Ahaz would imagine was meant, and would the connexion lead us to expect? If one had not read or heard of this prophecy being applied to Christ, would one from what is here said by the prophet, have ever been persuaded that the sign here spoken of, referred to an event in which Ahaz was intimately concerned, and which was foretold in order to confirm him in the belief of another event to which he as a wicked man and an idolater would pay no regard, and in which, as it would not happen till several hundred years after his death, he could feel no interest? Do not these things appear so clearly manifest, "that it would require no small degree of artifice and perverseness to give them any other application"? Blayney's Sermon, page 9. Every one, from attentively perusing this chapter, and unaffected by any hypothesis, would immediately say, that the sign must be a sign of the event which had been foretold, and of the truth of the prediction of which it was evidently the design of the Lord, by the mouth of the prophet, to convince the king.

2. This method of understanding it, is abundantly confirmed by all parallel passages in which signs of any thing predicted are asked for, or are granted; while the method fol-

lowed by Dr. B. in his interpretation, is directly the reverse of all similar facts. He may perhaps, be confidently challenged to produce an instance in which any thing is said about a sign till after the prophecy has been delivered, of which the sign promised is a confirmation. For brevity's sake let the reader refer to Genesis ix. 8—17, xii. 2, 3, xiii. 14—17, compared with xv. throughout. Exodus iii. 12; Judges vi. 17, 21, 22, 36—40; 1 Samuel ii. 34; 1 Kings xiii. 3, 5, 6; Isaiah xxxviii. 7, 8, 22, compared with 2 Kings xx. 8, 9; Jer. xlv. 29, 30. To these may be added the prophecy given by our Saviour in Matthew xxiv. 3—24; Luke xxi. 7—31, to which Dr. B. indeed, refers and calls our attention. Again, in Isaiah xxxvii., after the prediction of an event, we have a sign given in the circumstances of time, very similar with the one in question. The event had been foretold in the preceding verses. Verse 30, "And this shall be a sign unto thee," &c. In about three or four years after the prediction, the sign by which it is confirmed, as in the present instance, is accomplished. Thus "though attempts have been made to dispossess us of such authority by representing things otherwise, the blaze of truth has shone superior to any fallacious misrepresentations. Here, therefore, I shall leave things as they stand, since from an attempt to explain further what is sufficiently clear already, seldom any thing arises but perplexity, darkness and error." Sermon, pp. 2, 9.

From what has been said it appears clear, and may be justly concluded, that the sign spoken of in the 11th verse, must be in confirmation of the prediction delivered in verses 7—9; that the child whose birth is foretold in the 14th verse, and that spoken of in the 16th verse, must be the same child, and therefore cannot be Shear-jashub, but must be some child that would be shortly conceived, and in due time afterwards born. It is also plain that three prophecies of different events are delivered in this chapter. The first, in verses 7—9; the second, in verses 14—16; the third, in verses 17 to the end of the chapter, of a long train of events. Of these, that mentioned second would shortly

take place first, and would be a confirmation that that mentioned first would next take place in due time; and after these, in the course of events, would follow that mentioned last; though it might be at some distance of time, yet it would come to pass as assuredly as the others.

The meaning of the first and last of these three prophecies is sufficiently clear, and their fulfilment obvious. The difference of opinion and supposed difficulty of interpretation, lie in the second in the order of predictions, but first in that of fulfilment. This we shall now proceed particularly to explain, obviate objections which may be raised against it, and shew the prophecy accomplished in the event. With this latter article will be connected the fulfilment of the first prediction but second accomplished event. After this we may refer briefly to the history and fulfilment of the third prediction.

I. We are to explain this prophecy according to what appears to be the most consistent and just method of interpretation. As far as the beginning of the 14th verse has been already explained. The prophet then proceeds, "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and shall bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." It is asked, who is this person here called a virgin? The reply is, it is the prophetess spoken of in the 3rd verse of the following chapter; and the child spoken of in this prophecy is that which in chapter viii. is called Maher-shalal-hash-baz. The reason of applying the prophecy to these is the coincidence between vii. 16 and viii. 4. Before the child, mentioned vii. 16, shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land which Ahaz abhorred (that is Syria, of which Damascus was the head, and Ephraim, of which Samaria was the head) shall be left desolate of both her kings, Rezin and Pekah. Before the child, mentioned viii. 4, shall have knowledge to cry my father and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria.

And still farther does this appear confirmed by the close connexion there is between what is related in the last chapter and at the beginning of this. Isaiah was commanded to

go to Ahaz, and deliver him a message from the Lord. Again the prophet delivers another message from the Lord to the king. After he had thus spoken by the prophet to the king, he now, viii. 1, speaks to the prophet himself. "Moreover the Lord said unto me." As though he had said, after having spoken to the king as just related, the Lord spoke to me also, "Take thee a great roll, and write in it with a man's pen concerning Maher-shalal-hash-baz." But what he was to write concerning him, Isaiah has not informed us. From what follows it may be presumed that he was then going to do what God had commanded him. He took unto him faithful witnesses to record, Urijah the priest, and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah. And, after taking these to witness, he went in unto the prophetess, and she conceived, and bare a son.

By this it seems to be intimated that Isaiah was the father of the child to be born, this being in Hebrew the modest expression for the conjugal act. The same word is used with a similar signification in Genesis xx. 4, in speaking of Abimelech taking Sarah the wife of Abraham. When it is said that Abimelech had not come near her, it is not to be supposed that it was meant that he had not been in her company, nor conversed with her, for this undoubtedly he had done. Yet, fortunately, he had not come near her to lie with her. A word of similar import is oftentimes made use of to express modestly the same idea. What is afterwards added seems to confirm the supposition that Isaiah was the father of the child. For on the birth of the child the Lord said unto Isaiah, call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz. But why should he be commanded thus to call the child, if it had not been his? Would he not rather in that case have been commanded to go to the father or mother of the child, and in the name of the Lord have bid them to call it by that name? or it would have been expressed passively, his name shall be called, as is done in other instances.

When this interpretation is considered minutely, it gives us the reason of his taking, as witnesses, the persons who are there specially named, and

manifests the propriety of his so doing. To what particularly he took them as witnesses, whether of the truth of what the Lord had said unto him, or of his going in unto the prophetess, or of both, is not declared. In the general we may naturally and justly suppose it to have been that they should be witnesses of the prediction, by having it regularly written on a roll, and attested by them; and then afterwards of the truth of its fulfilment, when the prophecy should be accomplished, which was to be a sign unto Ahaz. On this supposition that they were to be witnesses to Ahaz of the message from the Lord, and of the conception and birth of Maher-shalal-hash-baz, who was appointed to be the promised sign to the king, there appears a great propriety in the prophet's taking *them*. For Urijah was the priest to Ahaz, see 2 Kings xvi. 10—16; and Zechariah, we may conclude, was some eminent person in his day, even the father-in-law of king Ahaz himself. He is mentioned 2 Kings xviii. 2, where his daughter is said to be the mother of Hezekiah, who was Ahaz's son. Zechariah was, therefore, the father of Abi, the wife of Ahaz. These, then, as it was observed, were very suitable persons to be witnesses to Ahaz of the accomplishment of the prediction which was to be the sign promised him.

Upon the supposition that Maher-shalal-hash-baz was Isaiah's son, and the child appointed as a sign unto Ahaz, we see the force and reason of the saying of the prophet, ch. viii. 18: "Behold, I and the children, whom thou has given me, are for signs in Israel." And does not what the prophet says, in ver. 8, confirm this supposition? After having spoken of the birth of this his son, how natural for him, when speaking of the land of Judah, to call it the land of this remarkable child, "thy land, O Immanuel!" because it was born and would dwell in that land. How natural, I say, such an apostrophe! And what could have been better adapted to shew us that the different names, Immanuel, Maher-shalal-hash-baz, pointed out one and the same child?

It also appears from the interpretation now given, that the essence or principal point of the sign did not consist in the *birth* of the child. The

circumstances relating to that are mentioned merely to designate the child intended; the son of the prophet Isaiah and of the prophetess, who might still be a young woman, if the predicted child were even not her first child. Nor is there any thing to oppose this latter supposition, for Shearjashub might be his son by another wife, who was now dead, and the prophet might then be about to marry, if he had not just then betrothed, this other wife; and he might even have possibly taken Urijah the priest, and Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah to be witnesses of this his marriage with the prophetess. The particular circumstance which constitutes the sign to Ahaz, is that mentioned ch. vii. ver. 16, and ch. viii. ver. 4, the death of the two kings and the desolation of their countries taking place before this particular child should know to cry my father and my mother, or to refuse the evil and to choose the good.

II. The objections which may be urged against this interpretation are next to be considered.

1. The difference of the names of this child may be objected by some. In ch. vii. ver. 14, he is called Immanuel; in ch. viii. ver. 4, Maher-shalal-hash-baz. The same difficulty will occur in applying ch. vii. ver. 14, to Jesus Christ, for the name Immanuel occurs only thrice in the Old and New Testament—Isa. vii. 14, viii. 8, and in Matt. i. 23, which is a quotation of the former text. In the second passage, it seems to refer, as shewn above, to the child who should be the sign to Ahaz, and of whose birth mention was made in ch. viii. ver. 3, and whom the prophet seems to apostrophize in the 8th verse, as hath been already stated.

Besides, it was not uncommon among the Jews for the same person to have two different names; especially when the sacred name of God occurred in one of them. The child, in such a case, was generally called by the other name, that they might avoid mentioning lightly and frequently the name of the Most High. This was the case in the present instance. But again, in ch. vii. ver. 14, it is not said that the child should be called Immanuel, nor was any direction given to name him so; but only that his mother would call him so. And by

this name the prophetess may have called him at first, till the Lord, after his birth, speaking again to Isaiah, called him by the name which was then specified, a name signifying, as in the margin of the Bible, making speed to the spoil, he hasteneth to the prey; implying in how short a time the king of Assyria would come and carry away the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria.

2. Another objection may be urged from the mother being called a virgin. But this does by no means imply that she had not known man till after the birth of this child. It may justly be said of a female conceiving her first child, that a virgin shall conceive. But the Hebrew term here used, *הַנְּבִיָּאָה*, does not necessarily signify one who still retains her virginity. It may signify merely a young woman. Agreeably to this observation, the Septuagint translate this word sometimes by *παρθενος*, and more frequently by *νεανις*. *Παρθενος*, it is acknowledged, is the Greek word which properly signifies a pure, undefiled virgin. But *νεανις* cannot be made to signify more than a young woman, corresponding with *νεανιας*, a young man, and *νεανισκος*, the diminutive of the other and the proper term for a youth.

But it may be objected that the Septuagint, in the present passage under discussion, translate by *παρθενος*, a virgin, and, therefore, we should understand the term in the strict sense. It may, however, be replied, the old fable of Aristeas is now too well exploded by Hody and others for it to obtain credit in the present day. We no longer consider those translators as inspired men, and, therefore, are not bound to look on every letter of their version as infallibly just; notwithstanding in some cases it may elucidate, and in others its authority may determine the extent of meaning which particular words will bear. For this latter purpose its authority is now produced, while we reject its guidance in the specific instance in question, for the reasons alleged above, why the context requires an explanation that does not admit or need such a version.

3. But this leads us to another objection. Though the authors of the Septuagint Version were not inspired, the Evangelist Matthew was, accord-

ing to the notions generally received, (which points I mean not now to discuss,) and he quotes this prophecy as applied to Christ, and by the virgin supposes that the Virgin Mary, the mother of our Lord, is intended. Still there is not any sufficient evidence adduced to set aside the interpretation given. Matthew, even if inspired, and this part genuine, might quote it not as a direct prophecy of the birth of Christ; but allusively, as a saying which might be applied to him with propriety, though the prophecy did not at all refer to him. He was the first child of his mother, and he was Immanuel, for in him it was manifested, or he was a sign, that God was with us mankind, and would by him deliver us. Agreeably to this the Greek of St. Matthew might be rendered, "All this was done; in which was accomplished what the Lord had spoken by the mouth of the prophet," &c.; that is, these are events similar to those spoken of from the Lord, by the mouth of the prophet, &c. The Greek particle, *ὅτε*, when taken adverbially, signifies *ubi*, where, in which, by which. In a similar way we might translate and interpret several other such passages, in this Evangelist particularly. Thus, ch. ii. ver. 15, is quoted from Hosea xi. 1; where the words of the prophet evidently refer to the calling of the children of Israel out of Egypt, in the time and by the hand of Moses. And again, ch. ii. vers. 17, 18, is quoted from Jeremiah xxxi. 15; where the words evidently refer to the desolation of Judah at the time of the captivity to Babylon.

But it may be asked, Would it not be more consistent with the words of the Evangelist, and the general scope of prophecy, to understand these predictions as referring to more than one distinct, definite event, as pointing out two similar events happening at different and distant times? By no means. It would introduce such confusion and uncertainty into the prophecies, as very nearly resembles the double-meaning answers of the ancient heathen oracles. This opens a wide door to the cavils and objections of infidelity, against which all true Christians should particularly guard themselves and their sacred writings. If this confusion and uncertainty be ad-

mitted, why should we not give credit to, and acknowledge the authority of, ancient heathen oracles, which, in some ambiguous, similar manner, could and actually did foretell future events? Than thus to expose our holy religion to contempt, and weaken one of the very strong proofs of its divinity and truth in the fulfilment of prophecy, it would be better even to suppose a sacred historian mistaken in his application of prophecies; for inspiration to guard him from the misapplication of these is by no means necessary to enable him to write authentic history. This, however, is not supposed in the interpretation we have just now given.

III. The fulfilment of the prophecy in the event, is what was next proposed to be considered and pointed out.

1. The accomplishment of the former part of the prophecy, delivered as a sign unto Ahaz, has been already shewn in the birth of Maher-shalal-hash-baz. Of the other part, the land of Syria and Ephraim being left desolate of both her kings before this child knew to refuse the evil and choose the good, a more particular consideration is required.

It is necessary to refer to notes of time given in the history of these transactions. Before Ahaz came to the throne, even in the time of Jotham his father, Pekah and Rezin were making preparations for war against Judah and Jerusalem. Ahaz came to the throne at twenty years of age. Two or three verses after mentioning this, without giving any intermediate note of time, in 2 Kings xvi. 5, it is said, "Then Rezin and Pekah came up to war against Jerusalem." It may hence be justly inferred, that this was very soon after Ahaz was seated on the throne; most probably in the first year of his reign. In Isa. vii. 2, we are informed, when Ahaz heard of the confederacy of Syria and Ephraim, his heart was moved. Upon this the prophet is commanded to go to him, as related in the following verses. Probably, then, Isaiah might speak to Ahaz, before Rezin and Pekah were actually come up against him, even while they were on the march, if not even previously to their setting out on it. If this be supposed then can there be no appearance of wishing to favour the prophecy, as the event must, in

that case, immediately succeed. Hence it is concluded, that Isaiah delivered to Ahaz the prophecies contained in this chapter soon, very soon, after he had succeeded his father as king of Judah, even in the first year of his reign. And this first year of Ahaz, according to 2 Kings xvi. 1, was the seventeenth of Pekah's reign over Israel.

In 2 Kings xv. 30, it is said that Pekah was slain by Hoshea, in the twentieth year of Jotham, son of Uzziah; that is, in the twentieth year from Jotham being made king, for Jotham himself reigned only sixteen years; see ver. 33. Now Pekah began to reign in the fifty-second year, that is, in the last year of Uzziah's reign; and he reigned twenty years. Compare ver. 2 with ver. 27. Jotham began to reign in the second year of Pekah, verse 32; and by comparing this with the last-quoted verse, it is plain that his reign would commence just after Pekah entered his second year. As Jotham reigned sixteen years, and Ahaz succeeded his father in the seventeenth of Pekah, it is hence inferred, that Ahaz began to reign just about, rather after than before, the time that Pekah completed his seventeenth year. Consequently the twentieth of Jotham will be some where in the third year of Ahaz, but before that year was completed. For add to rather more than one, (Pekah having just entered his second year,) the sixteen years of Jotham's reign, this will give rather more than the seventeenth of Pekah. As then there would not be three years wanting to complete the twentieth of Jotham, that would fall about the second, or at farthest before the third of Ahaz was completed. Ahaz then had not reigned three full years when Pekah was slain by Hoshea, and the land of Ephraim left desolate of her king.

Of Rezin there is not so particular an account given, nor have we such notes of time as will enable us so exactly to determine the time of his death. But from the narration given of it in 2 Kings xvi. 6—10, it may be inferred, that his death must have happened nearly about the same time. In the space of two years there seems a sufficient length of time for the accomplishment of all the intermediate

events; the success of the Syrians against the Jews, and the embassy from Ahaz to Tiglath-pileser, might take up one year; his descent upon Damascus, the capture of that city and people, with the slaughter of Rezin, might be accomplished in another. If so, this would be rather before the destruction of Pekah. Here again, then, it may be concluded that Ahaz had not reigned three years when this event took place. That is, it was about two years after the prophet had spoken unto the king, as recorded in Isaiah, ch. vii.

Now, as it is most probable that Isaiah went in unto the prophetess, and that she conceived shortly after the predictions had been delivered to Ahaz, and as nine months must be allowed for the time of gestation, the birth of the child Maher-shalal-hash-baz, must have been some time in the second year of Ahaz. Thence reckoning forward till the time of the death of Rezin and Pekah, in the third year of Ahaz, as has just now been shewn, the age of the child could not have been two years; very likely not much more than one. At that age, it is by no means probable that he should be able to cry my father and my mother. Consequently, according to Isa. viii. 4, the riches of Damascus, and the spoil of Samaria, were taken away before that time. In like manner it may be added, that at that age the child could not know to refuse the evil and choose the good. And, therefore, before that period, agreeably to Isa. vii. 16, the land which Ahaz abhorred was left desolate of both her kings. Thus the prediction and accomplishment of the sign have been verified.

2. It is also said, that "within threescore and five years" from the time of the prophecy being delivered, "Ephraim shall be broken that it be not a people." This also we shall verify by shewing its accomplishment. In doing which the notes of time must be collected from the account of the reigns of the kings of Judah and Israel, and from a comparison of the two together. That there may not appear to be any favouring of the prophecy, it will be proper to compute rather above than under what may be exactly indicated.

From the time of the Prophecy being delivered by Isaiah,

Ahaz reigned sixteen years, 2 Kings xvi. 2.

Hezekiah reigned twenty-nine years, 2 Kings xviii. 2.

But Samaria was taken, and Ephraim broken, that it was not a people in the sixth year of Hezekiah, ch. xviii. vers. 9—11. These six years then being added to the sixteen of Ahaz's reign, this event happened about twenty-two years after the prediction, that is, it was much within the limited time of sixty-five years, that Ephraim was broken, that it was not a people.

From the time of the Prophecy being delivered by Isaiah,

Pekah reigned three years, 2 Kings xv. 27. and xvi. 1. He was cut off in the third of Ahaz, by Hoshea, who began to reign in the twelfth year of Ahaz's reign. Consequently there was an interregn of nine years.—Hoshea reigned nine years, ch. xvii. ver. 1; Pekah reigned three, making together twenty-one or twenty-two years, agreeably to the result of the reigns of the kings of Judah. Thus, then, is this prediction of the prophet fully verified.

3. It is again added, that if Ahaz did not believe, surely he should not be established. The Lord would bring upon him, his people and his father's house, the king of Assyria and the Egyptians. By them the country would be laid desolate, the people led away captive, and every thing destroyed. For the accomplishment of this, see 2 Chron. xxviii. 20; xxxii. 1, 9; xxxiii. 11; xxxv. 20—24; and xxxvi. throughout. These passages, with the corresponding ones in 2 Kings, and their parallels in several of the prophets, abundantly verify this third prediction delivered in the name of the Lord, by Isaiah to Ahaz himself.

"I am now come to a conclusion of what I had to offer on this very plain prophecy; which appears, methinks, with so much consistency, clearness and unity, from the beginning throughout, that I flatter myself we cannot be far from seeing it in its true and proper light. I am not conscious of the least force put upon the natural construction or meaning of the words. Unbelievers can no longer deride us for admitting a fact for a sign, which, both on account of the

time of its exhibition, and the very nature of it, could not possibly answer any such purpose. For how, said they, not without some show of reason, could a person be persuaded of a future event, which he was disposed to question, merely from being told, at the same time, and upon the same authority only, that a second event, not less improbable than the first, should succeed it in after ages? The answer has been already given, and the sign shewn to result from a precurrence of facts, well attested by credible witnesses, and, therefore, impossible to be overlooked or mistaken; not posterior to, but preceding, what was meant to be established by them." See Blayney's Sermon, pp. 14, 15.

Exeter,

August 17, 1823.

SIR,

IN your monthly list of New Publications you have omitted to notice a very extraordinary work by Dr. Fletcher, a Catholic Priest, entitled, "Thoughts on the Rights and Privileges of Church and State."

I caught a glimpse of the book as it passed through Exeter, and in that cursory view of it met with assertions which astonished me and will surprise those readers of the Repository who have not met with the publication.

At page 86, he says, "It is not true that the constitution of this country is Protestant. It is on the contrary much rather Catholic. When it is said that the constitution is Protestant, is the meaning of the assertion this, that therefore the king and his ministers, the members of the legislature and of the government are or ought to be, the believers of the thirty-nine articles, or the professors of the doctrines of the Church of England? Is such the import of the term? No, it is not, because we may remark the state for ever admits into its councils and its cabinet, into its parliament and various offices, men of very different and even opposite religions, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Methodists, &c., nay even sometimes, men of *no* religion, (for we have seen even this,) Socinians, Unitarians, Deists and unbelievers. Therefore the consequence is, that the constitution is not Protestant in this sense, that men are bound in order to enjoy the

privileges of the state to profess the religion of the state."

There is so much confusion in the style of this writer, that it is not always easy to find out his meaning. In the above passage he discovers a total ignorance of Protestantism, and the principles on which it is founded. I had always understood that a Protestant was one who rejected the corruptions of the church of Rome, and who appealed to the Scriptures as the sole rule of faith and practice. This I found asserted in innumerable writers, and the truth of it is evident from the whole history of the reformation. In these principles, "Calvinists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Socinians and Unitarians," are united with the Church of England, without a single exception.

This writer is not the first who has associated the Unitarians with Deists. And if to distinguish Christianity from its corruptions, to preach and live under the warrant of Scripture, and to inculcate sound morals on the prospect of that immortality which was brought to light by the gospel, be a sign of Deism, Unitarians will have no objection to the name of Deists. The frequent use of these invidious aspersions, by intolerant bigots, will take out their sting. The world is not so ready as it has been, to follow the cry of designing men. To affirm the globe we inhabit to be round, was deemed heresy a few ages back, and for asserting its motion the immortal Galileo was confined in the dungeons of the Inquisition. But the term heretic has, in these more enlightened times lost its dreadful sound. The worst heresies that ever infested religion are found to be spiritual pride, priestly ambition, the love of dominion, and the spirit of persecution.

But to place us on a footing with "Deists and Unbelievers," does not satisfy this Dr. Fletcher. He will not allow us to have any religion. He has falsely, malevolently, and without the smallest provocation, insulted those who merited far other treatment from a Catholic. In whatever light I view his conduct, it appears to me weak, indiscreet and ungrateful. While the claims of the Catholics to an enlargement of their toleration was opposed by the mem-

bers of the Established Church, the Unitarian Dissenters, knowing what it is to be excluded from the common rights of citizens, advocated their cause. But to plead with such a person on principles of liberality and gratitude, is to address him in a language he does not or will not understand. From Dr. Fletcher we can appeal with pleasure to other Catholics of more enlarged and liberal minds. To use the words of another Catholic clergyman, "I have conversed, indeed, only with men of liberal minds, and as long as I am permitted to choose my own company, I will associate with no others. When they cease to be found, it will be time to retire to the woods."* I have the pleasure of being well acquainted with another clergyman of that communion in this city, who is one of its brightest ornaments, and would be an honour to any communion, who is animated with the same liberal spirit and has expressed his unqualified disapprobation of this publication.

JAMES MANNING.

P. S. While the author represents the different sects of Protestants as being of different and even opposite religions, is he aware that Protestants might, on the same grounds, assert that the Augustines, Benedictines, Carmelites, Dominicans, Franciscans, and a variety of other sects, such as the Jesuists, the Jansenists, and Molinists, are of different religions?

SIR,

July 24, 1823.

I CANNOT discern any degree of similarity between the mystery of *eternity* and the supposed mystery in the *Athanasian Creed*; for so I choose to designate the popular doctrine, rather than by the term *Trinity*, which being an equivocal word, may be, and often is adopted by persons of different sentiments, in *their own sense*. It is therefore high time that this term should be discarded. Controversialists make sad work of it, by not using explicit terms. Hence, "everlasting discussion, and no conclusion." But—to the point. I think that your correspondent (p.

* Rev. Joseph Berington.

339) has not sufficiently attended to the important distinction between a mystery or *difficulty*, i. e. something beyond the reach of our present faculties, and a manifest absurdity or contradiction. The Scriptures allude to *three* sorts of mysteries; first, those of the kind first mentioned; secondly, something formerly doubtful or concealed, but now made manifest; and lastly, the mysteries of *Antichrist*, or of "Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, and of the abominations of the earth." In this latter sense, it has been well said, that "there are no mysteries in the gospel."

In the quotation from Dr. Priestley, the writer views the sublime subject only in the same light in which it has been represented by the greatest divines and philosophers. "In our idea," says the Doctor, we consider an "eternity past," and an "eternity to come," the former as diminishing, and the latter as increasing; *time* being the *isthmus* or stage between them: but this is only "*in our idea*," for eternity in the *abstract*, or strict philosophical sense, hath neither beginning nor ending; it is invariable, or infinite duration; as *time* is successive, or limited duration. This appears to me to be the sense of the passage, and by repeating the phrase "*in our idea*," the Doctor evidently intended to point out the *modes* of the Divine existence as utterly incomprehensible by us; but this statement is so far from involving a contradiction, that on the contrary it is a *self-evident proposition*, since nothing can be plainer than the axiom of Dr. Clarke, expressed in his peculiar, concise and energetic language, than that, "as something now is, it is evident that something always was;" and this "something that always was," must be *mind*, and not matter—which is the grand argument against Atheism.

Your correspondent intimates that the Doctor has supposed "the Deity must have exerted his creative power from all eternity;" but he has not quoted the passage. This however, appears to be a topic far beyond the reach of our present faculties. If to suppose the Almighty passing an eternity (so to speak) solely in the contemplation of his own perfections,

might seem to imply a defect in his benevolence; and on the other hand, to consider *creation* as an eternal effect of an eternal cause, must ever appear to us almost to involve a contradiction; we can only conclude that these things are among the Divine incomprehensibles, and cry out with the great apostle upon another occasion, "O the depth!" It is of great importance to know *where to stop*, as well as when to proceed. "The meek will he guide in judgment, and the meek will he teach his way."

As to the other supposed mysterious doctrine of Dr. Southwood Smith and other Necessarians, the subject being, by common consent as it were, proscribed your pages, I shall only skim the surface. We are under great obligations to the Doctor for his book on "the Divine Government." If he has embraced any sentiments which are *contradictory* as well as mysterious, and which in the opinion of many thinking persons, are dishonourable to the Divine character and government, no doubt they have not so appeared to him. If any one could explain a knotty point in divinity or philosophy, to the level of plain understandings, it would be Dr. Hartley, but many have thought his arguments upon this point weak and inconclusive. To say that the Almighty cannot carry on his plans here below, without the arm of the assassin, the depredations of the robber, the blasphemies of the impious, and the machinations of wicked statesmen and politicians, which render the earth a scene of carnage and of blood; in a word, to represent the divine regiment or œconomy, with regard to his creature *man*, as "*divided against itself*," is to adopt a scheme of moral philosophy, which should certainly not be hastily taken up, and which many (otherwise) orthodox writers and divines have thought it necessary to discard.

"Plac'd for his trial, on this bustling stage,
From thoughtless youth to ruminating age;
Free in his will, to choose or to refuse,
Man may improve the crisis or abuse.
Else, on the Fatalist's unrighteous plan,
Say to what bar amenable were man?"

With nought in charge, he could betray
no trust;
And if he fell, would fall because he
must.
If love reward him, or if vengeance
strike,
His recompence in both, *unjust alike*.*

I. L.

SIR,

IF you think the following essay, which remains among the papers of the Rev. John Holland, of Mobberley, (of whom see Vol. V. p. 327,) may be read with some advantage by those engaged in the present discussion on Providence, it is at your service.

V. F.

That all events, both great and small, are appointed by the providence of God, is indisputably the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. The history which they give us of the Jews and other nations, the incidents relating either to societies or to particular persons, are constantly mentioned as proceeding from God, who is frequently mentioned by our Lord himself, and by all the sacred writers, as directly concerned in whatever happens. We are apt, indeed, to regard the affairs of our own race, as of peculiar importance; and therefore as worthy, in an especial manner, of the Divine care and superintendence. But the Scriptures assure us, that not only the concerns of mankind, but those also of the most inconsiderable orders of existence, are managed by the Father of all. "These all wait upon him, and he giveth them their meat in due season; he openeth his hand, they are satisfied with good." "Behold the fowls of the air; for they sow not, neither do they reap, yet our heavenly Father feedeth them." Nor is his goodness confined to living creatures; he forms and cherishes the very grass and flowers of the field, and clothes them with inimitable excellence and beauty.

But this doctrine of an universal providence is, perhaps, most strongly asserted in our Saviour's instructions to his disciples, when he was sending them out to preach the gospel. After warning them of the persecution and cruel treatment they should meet with, he proceeds to suggest several

arguments which should enable them bravely to face and cheerfully to bear the sufferings and hardships to which they would be exposed. Among other things, he reminds them of the providence of God, than which no consideration is better suited to fortify the minds of good men against the evils and calamities of life. "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall to the ground without your Father; but the very hairs of your head are all numbered: fear not, therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows." As if he had said, "Be not discouraged by the prospect of those sufferings of which I have forewarned you; for nothing can happen to you but under the cognizance and by the appointment of God. His care extends to all affairs, however minute and inconsiderable. Beings, much inferior in dignity, and things which seem of the most trifling nature, fall under his inspection, and are ordered and conducted by his providence. Be assured, therefore, that you, and what concerns you, will not be overlooked. He knows every thing that concerns you; and how should he but know it, since he was the original cause of it? As he is acquainted with your sufferings, you cannot doubt but he will reward you for them; and as they proceed from his wise and just appointment, you ought to bear them with cheerfulness and patience."

In illustration of these words I shall endeavour to shew, that the providence of God extends to all things, however minute, and seemingly of a trifling nature. And this appears to me the more necessary, as I am afraid it is a truth not much believed, and less attended to by the generality of mankind. For it is now become somewhat unfashionable, and regarded as the work of a vulgar and superstitious mind, to search for providence in the daily occurrences of life, and to ascribe common and ordinary events to the Divine Power. There is, indeed, no occasion that we should be perpetually talking of God and providence; this might look like hypocrisy and affectation, and might give reason to suspect that we are desirous to seem very devout, whether we really are so or not. But though it may not be proper that God should be in all our discourse, yet we ought to keep him

* *Couper's Prog. of Error.*

in all our thoughts, and to bear upon our minds an habitual and constant regard to him; if it be actually true, as I shall now attempt to prove, that all the common events of life are referred to him, and that nothing can happen to us, or to any other being, but by his appointment.

That there is a God who created the world and presides in it, is plain from the harmony, order and beauty of nature; that this Supreme Being is powerful, wise and good, appears from the amazing grandeur and exquisite contrivance of the several parts of the universe, and from the conspiring tendency of all particular beings to the welfare and perfection of the whole. At present I shall not enlarge upon the proofs of this principle; but, taking for granted the existence and perfections of God, and his direction of the greater parts and revolutions of the world, I would endeavour to shew that, as certainly as these principles are true, so certainly the Divine care reaches to the most minute affairs, and to those events which seem to be of less consequence.

This will appear to be highly probable, if it be considered, that the world is not a collection of loose and separate beings, but one connected plan and regular system, all whose parts, both great and small, are joined in the strictest union to the whole and to one another. The vegetable creation sustains the animal, and both depend upon the earth and other elements. This globe, with whatever belongs to it, is connected with the sun, and with its fellow-wanderers the planets. Now, in a system whose parts have so extensive an influence, and such infinite mutual ties and relations, is it possible that the general concern should be tolerably conducted and provided for, if no regard be had to the least things in it? For these being neglected, and suffered to run at random, may bring disorder and confusion upon the greatest. If this earth of ours be worthy of the Divine notice and concern, is it not chiefly for the sake of its living inhabitants, which would inevitably perish, were not the plants and trees produced to support them? And if the Divine care extends to the formation of plants and trees, must it not also be employed in the revolution of the seasons, and the

influence of the heavenly bodies; the state of the air, the surface of the earth, and the due provision of the necessary juices? Thus the care of one thing includes in it the care of a thousand. An attention to what is of greater importance, supposes also an attention to what is of less; nor could the whole, or the more considerable parts, of nature, be governed and preserved, while particular beings, and what concerns them, were overlooked and neglected. If but one of the movements in the vast machine were suffered to stand still, if one small spring did but cease to act, or acted in an undue or irregular manner, the whole would presently be thrown into disorder, and might justly be said to want guidance and direction. We must either, then, deny a Providence altogether, or acknowledge that this Providence is universal.

In like manner, the changes which happen in the world are not a number of independent events, of which one, or a few, might be neglected without prejudice to the rest; but are connected together, so as to form one immense and beautiful scheme, which, if the least part were undirected, the whole would be disturbed and broken. Every thing springs from a mixture of various causes, of different importance and efficacy; and every particular being, however inconsiderable, contributes its share to a multitude of effects, and often to such as are readily acknowledged to be of great importance. What is now present is the offspring of the past in a long ascending series, and will be the parent of what is future, in an indefinite descending succession; and that which is present in one place may affect and be affected by a vast number of other things in different places. Now, in this complicated scene of causes and effects, what bounds can we assign to the Divine Providence? Or where is the precise point, concerning which we may with any reason pronounce, that just hitherto it goes, and no farther? Those who are assured that it has its limits, must certainly know where they are. Let such describe these limits exactly, and we then shall yield up the point. Does God concern himself about mankind? If not, it is not worth our while to dispute whether there be any Providence at all or

not, interesting itself about other beings, for what is that to us? But if mankind be the object of the Divine care, so are the particular nations of the earth, and so, too, are the individuals that compose them: for the human race is nothing but a number of individuals; and, therefore, to say that *every one* is neglected, is the same as to say that the whole are so. Taking it for granted, therefore, that the Supreme mind vouchsafes to direct the affairs of you and me, what circumstances of our being are disposed by him? What shall we say as to our place, our duration, our company, and the part we are to act? Are all, or some only, of these appointed by God? If only some, which are they? and why they more than the rest? Nay rather, since all the events of life are so strangely interwoven with each other, how is it possible that one part of them should be ordered, and all the rest be undetermined? Each of us, therefore, and all his affairs, is comprehended in that compass which Providence takes in. But this could not be, unless the affairs of other beings, to whom we are related, were also contained in the divine order. It were easy to carry this point farther, and to trace down Providence from the stars of heaven to the most inconsiderable affairs of this lower world. But what has been said may suffice to shew, that if we be once fairly brought to acknowledge a Providence at all, we can never find where to stop, till we have allowed that this Providence extends to all beings, the lowest as well as the highest.

Perhaps it may be said, there may be limits to the Divine Providence, though on account of the weakness of our faculties we may not discern and cannot distinctly apprehend them: and therefore these arguments are calculated rather to perplex than satisfy the mind. I grant it; and for that very end this reasoning was here applied, that if any were prejudiced in favour of the contrary opinion, they might see that it also has its difficulties. For when he who has been positive in an opposite belief, can once be made to doubt and hesitate, he is come half way to conviction, and placed in the best situation for discerning the force of more di-

rect and conclusive reasoning. Such as, in the present case, the following appears to be.

The same reasons which we have to believe that Providence is concerned in the great affairs and revolutions of the universe, evince with equal certainty that the Divine influence extends also to the most minute things. For why do we imagine that God governs the sun, moon and stars, but because of their beauty, order, regular motion and beneficial effects? And are use, beauty, order, seen only in the heavenly bodies? Are they not as clearly discerned in all the parts of nature, in every being with which we are acquainted? The sea is beautiful, the streams and rivers are also beautiful. Beauty is diffused over the face of the whole earth. It is found in the barren deserts and wilds of nature, as well as in the cultivated plains. It appears on the rugged rocks and bleak mountains, in the stately forest and shady grove. It lives through all life, both animal and vegetable. It appears in a high degree in those beings which are endowed with sense and mind: and in the highest in such as are blest with reason and moral sentiments. But in some measure it is communicated to the least and meanest of nature's works. Every tree, plant and flower, every beast, bird, fish and insect, partake of it. Symmetry, order, a nice adjustment of parts to each other, and of the whole inward and outward structure to its circumstances and mode of life, obtain in every creature.

And as grace and beauty are every where shed abroad, so every being is of some use and service, and contributes in its place to the general good. The elements furnish the materials, and are made to assist in the formation and growth of vegetables and animals, which no sooner die than their bodies tend to dissolution, and hasten to prepare for other services. Plants and trees at once adorn the earth, and support the various tribes of living creatures, which enjoy life themselves, and administer to the welfare and preservation of each other. The very lowest class of them is not useless, and could not be wanted without some harm to the general system. Now since order and

use are aimed at and effected, as in the more magnificent, so also in the least and most inconsiderable parts of nature, have we not as good reason to acknowledge the hand of God in the one as in the other? Wherever beauty appears, and the general welfare is consulted, there God is present, there he acts. But these ends are every where pursued, in all the regions of nature, in all kinds and degrees of life, in earth and air and sea, and in the make and disposal of each particular being.

If God, at the same time that he directs and manages the universe in general, yet takes no care of minute affairs and particular beings, it must be either because he cannot, or because he will not. That he cannot, we shall scarcely affirm: for which is easier, to create worlds, and keep them in rapid and regular motion, or to form and dispose of a single plant or animal? You acknowledge that he is able to effect the former; he must therefore be equal to the latter, which requires no greater expense of power.

Nor need we be concerned lest the Deity should be perplexed by attending to such a vast multiplicity of creatures and events, or lest he should neglect some of them, because he cannot, or not without difficulty, oversee them all. This would be to make man the standard of God, and to measure an infinite mind by our limited and imperfect powers. And yet even our minds, narrow as they are, can with ease comprehend many things at the same time. We, who are confined to so small a part of space, can view at once a large prospect, and take in all its varieties of hills and plains, woods and rivers, to a considerable distance. And can we imagine that the Divine mind, which is every where present, is not able to see all things every where and at once? We can, in an instant, observe the affairs of different persons, societies and nations: and is it likely that he, from whom these minds of ours are derived, and who infinitely exceeds all his creatures in every kind of perfection, cannot with ease comprehend the affairs of the whole universe, and attend at once to all beings, nations and worlds? It is plain,

then, that the power and wisdom of God are equal to the direction of the most minute affairs, however numerous.

If, therefore, he do not dispose and govern them, it must be because he will not. But that he will direct all, even the minute and inconsiderable affairs, may easily be shewn, if we will only admit this principle, that he will always do what is best. And what can induce him to act otherwise? Not sloth or cowardice: for sloth proceeds from some uneasiness in acting; and cowardice from a sense of weakness and a fear of danger. But the Divine nature acts without difficulty, and is not obnoxious to any fear; every object yields to its will, and immediately assumes that very nature, place and form, which he would have it. "He speaks, and it is done; he commands, and it is established." Neither can he, like man, be drawn aside from doing what is best, by selfish views of any kind: for what interest can the universal mind possibly have, inconsistent with, or even different from, the interest and good of the whole? But here it is needless to enlarge; since we are now reasoning with those who acknowledge that God is perfectly good; and a Being perfectly good will continually do what is best.

And now to complete the argument. If God will do what is best, he will concern himself in those affairs which may seem to us of the least consequence. For can it be best, that, while great things and events are directed, smaller affairs should be left at random? Were it not better that all things, small as well as great, should be appointed and ordered by the Supreme Wisdom? Let us consider what is the case in matters directed by human art or prudence. Ask the mechanist, whether his clock or watch will be more perfect, if all the parts of it are made and adjusted in the exactest manner, or if none but the principal movements are accurately wrought, and justly disposed. So it is in the government of the Universe, which being as closely united into one system, and composed of parts as intimately connected as the most curious and complicated machine, the whole of it cannot be

administered in the best manner, unless the Divine Providence extend to all beings and events, however trivial and inconsiderable they may some of them appear to us.

Our reasoning, on the whole, stands thus. The Divine Being *can* direct the most minute affairs and events: he *will* do what is best: but it *is* best, that all affairs, as well the less as the more important, should be directed; and therefore he both can and will, that is, he actually *does*, appoint and determine the smallest things and most inconsiderable events.

Upon the whole, then, we conclude, that from God all things proceed, and by him all things are governed. Nothing is left out of the scheme of his providence. Whatever we meet with in the world, whatever company or accommodations we find, whatever we do or suffer, makes a part of the divine order. God grant that, as all things proceed from him, we may refer all things to him; and receive both the blessings and afflictions of life with becoming piety and veneration; remembering whence they come, and for what end they were designed.

CESTRIENSIS POSTHUMUS.

Bristol,
June, 1823.

SIR,
I AGREE with the views of your correspondent Mr. Luckcock, in his remarks on a Particular Providence, (pp. 286—292,) so far as they respect the tendency of that doctrine to confine our ideas of the moral government of the Deity, and the pernicious consequences it is calculated to produce on the dispositions and conduct of those who entertain it. But I cannot accord in his observations relating to the universality of the Divine administration; and it is in the hope of placing this subject in a juster light, that I am induced to intrude the following remarks upon your notice. In so doing let me not be thought to undervalue the spirit of practical utility and benevolent intention which distinguish Mr. L.'s communication.

I am not more desirous than your correspondent, of "entering the boundless and thorny field of controversy, respecting fate, predestination,

free will and philosophical necessity;" but I may be allowed to state that the views which I wish to lay before you are in my own case derived from a full and I trust practical belief of the latter doctrine. I do not, however, conceive that such a belief is by any means necessary to their reception. "He who advocates the plainest and most intelligible hypothesis, is best co-operating with the Deity in teaching mankind their various duties and their future expectations." Such I believe to be the tendency of the opinions which I entertain. They appear to me calculated beyond any others, to illustrate the condition and circumstances of man, and the moral government of God.

That the Supreme Being, the Creator of the universe, is infinite in power and in knowledge, will be generally admitted; and it follows that he must, from the beginning, have known and consequently willed, every event which should take place in his creation throughout eternity. Respecting the system on which he regulates its concerns, there are various opinions. It is maintained by some that he did at the first impress upon the universe certain laws, by which all its motions and changes, natural and moral, are continually regulated, and then left it to pursue its course, independently of his own immediate controul. Others suppose that the more important concerns of the world are under the Divine direction, but that the general current of events is left to form its own channel, receiving at times such impulses as suit the views of Almighty Wisdom. There are those again who believe that every part of the creation is under the constant direction of the Deity, by whom the whole is maintained and regulated, and whose influence is felt alike throughout every instant of time, and every corner of the universe. What Mr. L.'s view is, I cannot exactly discover, but the last he decidedly opposes. Yet it is this which alone appears to me consistent with what we know of the Almighty, and with what we observe around us.

Mankind too generally found their conceptions of the Divine nature, upon what knowledge they possess

respecting their own, forgetting that it is impossible to establish any analogy between that which is frail and finite, and that which is perfect and infinite. In pursuing subjects of this kind, it is necessary, as a first step, to divest the mind of every idea of that limitation and uncertainty which must attend all human operations. Infinity admits of no limitations and of no degrees,

I would here remark that the illustration of the two watches, which your correspondent employs, is not fairly applicable to the subject. We consider the one a more perfect piece of mechanism than the other, because the attention of the artist is not directed from any other pursuit to attend to it. But this does not apply to the operations of the Almighty. Could we conceive that infinite space, with all the creatures it contains, were infinitely multiplied, still an infinite Being would be equally adequate to its support and guidance.

In the formation of the universe, the Deity must have had a certain design; and to accomplish this, he must necessarily have employed those means and those alone, which would best produce it. It is absurd to suppose that Infinite Wisdom would create beings without any object, or that Infinite Power would form such as did not in every respect answer their intended end. It follows, therefore, that every creature, and in like manner every event, contributes in its requisite share to the purposes of the Supreme Mind.

To a Being of unlimited knowledge and power, all events, whether past or future, must be equally present—equally easy to effect—the grandest and the most trivial to human comprehension alike requiring the exertion only of the Almighty will. Every portion of his creation, animate and inanimate, must be known to him, and occupy an equal share of his attention.

So far from shrinking from "the unavoidable conclusions which must be admitted, before we can conceive that the whole human race is under such minute superintendence," I readily close in with them, requiring only that the same principles should be extended to every creature, to

every event within the range of time and space. Your correspondent asks, "what adequate idea can possibly be formed of such minute and incessant attention being necessary to uphold the harmony and good order of the whole? The human mind is bewildered on the very threshold of the conjecture." And well it may be. But here he falls into the error which I have pointed out, conceiving of the Divine nature by the limited standard of his own. Is it not presumptuous to pronounce that such are not the design and operations of Omniscience? Surely it is most honourable to the Deity to extend and not to narrow the sphere of his energy.

Mr. L. justly observes, "What is the difference in the estimation of perfect wisdom, between the highest state of human refinement, and its most humiliating imbecility? They can be no other than equal in his parental regard." And where then are we to draw the line between the lowest of our own species, and all the successive gradations of created beings? Why should not the life of every sparrow be the object of the care and solicitude of its Maker? Why should not every worm of our gardens, and every gnat of the interminable desert, enjoy the regard of infinite benevolence?

According to the foregoing views, the doctrine of a particular Providence falls naturally to the ground. For as every event must have its proper end in the purposes of the Deity, none can possibly occur, without being requisite as a link in the great chain. However extraordinary therefore to human comprehension certain ordinations of Providence may appear, it is evident that they could not in reality have been otherwise. Such events, nevertheless, though certain and necessary in themselves, are to us perfectly contingent; and to a well-disposed mind, this view will excite as much gratitude for unexpected mercies, as that which represents them as peculiar interpositions of divine favour.

I know not, Sir, whether I shall have made my ideas as intelligible as I could desire. If what I have written should contribute to produce in any one a clearer and more uniform

sense of the Divine power and presence, a stronger confidence in the rectitude and kindness of his proceedings, and more expanded conceptions of his nature, my object will be fully attained.

Φ.

On Mr. Luckcock's Remarks on Providence.

"Deorum providentia, mundus administratur; iidemq. consulunt rebus humanis; neq. solum universis, verum etiam singulis." CIC.

SIR,

June 26, 1823.

IN adverting to the commonly received doctrine of a Providence, general and particular, (for generals are made up of particulars,) it may be observed first, that it is impossible in this case to prove a negative. The omnipresence and omniscience of the Deity being universally acknowledged, his superintending providence appears to be a necessary consequence; otherwise, you must suppose universal presence conjoined with infinite inactivity, which notion seems a species of refined epicureanism. It is true that we know nothing of the manner of the Divine Omnipresence, but we prove the fact by the same arguments from which we prove his being. When philosophers represent the Deity as the soul of the world, as filling universal space, or as comprehending all things within himself, it is evident that these are very imperfect illustrations of a subject, to which no human language is adequate, because they are ideas borrowed from the qualities or properties of matter, which are not applicable to the Supreme Being, and whose peculiar and distinguishing characteristic it is, that he is an infinite Spirit. Perhaps the symbol of the ancient Egyptians in their hieroglyphics is, in this view, the best adapted to our present apprehensions. They represented the figure of an eye with a sceptre, as in a conspicuous part of the heavens, to denote the universal dominion and providence of the Almighty. As the eye of a man upon an extensive plain, and much more upon an eminence, can clearly discern a prodigious space, to every point of which he may be said to be in some

measure present; as the eye or ken of an angel may be easily conceived to extend much farther in its operation, and to take in a more prodigious scope, so the eye of the Almighty (speaking after the manner of men) pervades universal nature. It is immediately and intimately present in every point of space, and throughout every moment of duration. This sublime principle is inimitably set forth by the royal poet in Ps. cxxxix., and in another place he observes, "The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good." How then can he be supposed as inattentive to the works of his hands, to the laws of nature (so called) which he hath ordained, or to the moral conduct of his rational offspring!

But it is asked, Which manifests the greatest skill, a watch occasionally to be wound up, or one endowed with a perpetual motion? When the latter curiosity shall have been produced, we may possibly answer this question. In the mean time we shall observe, that though the material universe is governed in general by fixed laws, we cannot deny to its great Author the power of departing from or suspending those laws upon particular occasions. It is upon this principle that we believe in the miracles of the Jewish and Christian dispensations. And with respect to what are called the laws of nature, or the general economy of the Almighty in the government of the universe, it may perhaps be questioned without irreverence, whether Omnipotence itself can so impress inert matter, (which, however modified and organized, is matter still,) as to proceed in one uniform course for thousands of years without any material deviations or irregularities. Dr. S. Clarke ranks this idea only among the possibilities, for it is allowed by all divines, rational and irrational, (the casuists of the Romish church excepted,) that the Divine power is not to be considered as extending to palpable absurdities and contradictions, or to natural impossibilities, or rather that such things are not proper objects of power, and therefore not to be predicated of the Divine. Now, the mundane system, though calculated for a much longer duration than any

framed by human art, is still a machine evidently dependent upon a variety of causes, and incapable as it should seem of going on continually of itself, or on the supposition of the withdrawal (so to speak) of the original contriver. When a man makes a machine, if a good workman, he proceeds upon certain principles which never fail him, and his work remains (barring accidents) as long as its nature and construction will admit; but when we view the great machine of the universe, we can only judge of it from its effects, and know very little of the causes of those effects. Abbé La Pluche has clearly shewn that when philosophers talk of attraction and repulsion, gravity and continuity, they use words without ideas, and can justly reason only as to matters of fact and experience. What is cohesion? We can give no account why those immense masses of granite constituting Waterloo Bridge, which appear to the eye as an infinite number of molecules glued together, should remain stationary and be likely so to remain for ages, rather than be every moment in danger of separating and crumbling into dust, further than that the Almighty will have it so. And the planets might surely as easily be kept in their orbits by the instrumentality of invisible vortices, as by the centrifugal and centripetal forces. And why does not the attraction at the centre of the earth, which they say extends to the moon, level all the hills and mountains, and render it as simply round as the globes on which its surface is portrayed? Nature, it is to be feared, would prove but a clumsy manager if all were left to her own discretion: witness those parts of the world which are committed in a great measure to human management and controul. In the capacious but dismal and neglected forests of the torrid zone, we read that the increase of vegetation, the accumulation of ages, is so immense and so impenetrable as to defy all human art to render them habitable: hence they are the resort only of savage beasts and deadly serpents, the very air is rendered baleful and pestiferous, and the sandy desert of the Arab, seated in his tent, surrounded by his tribe and accompanied by

his faithful camel, becomes a far more desirable residence.

"Nature does rough-hew and design,
Leaves art to polish and refine."

Now, if from these considerations we ascend to the upper regions, and reflect that any material deviation of the planets from their orbits, as they revolve through the unfathomable depths of æther, would involve the wreck of the whole system, men of plain understandings will draw a rational conclusion.

Mr. Luckcock relates a story from Mrs. Cappe, and also gives us one of his own, both of which he represents in a ludicrous light. But there is in reality nothing ludicrous in such events; and every good man that has experienced eminent and seasonable deliverances, (and who has not experienced them?) will generally ascribe them to the superintendency, and in some remarkable cases, to the interposition of Providence in his behalf; nor in such cases, can the most ardent expressions of gratitude to the Deity ever be justly deemed "a purpose little required;" but, on the contrary, a debt of interminable obligation, and, like the principle from which it flows, "still paying, still to owe!" Doubtless, a man should be grateful for his crosses as well as for his comforts, when they have been instrumental in promoting his moral and religious improvement.

Some years ago, a merchant was about to engage in a foreign concern, and with this view had embarked the greater part of his property; when the ship was under sailing orders, as he was going on board he fell down and broke his leg, and of course remained on shore: in a short time the vessel was cast away, the cargo and all the crew lost. He soon, however, recovered his health and was gradually restored to prosperity. What are we to make of this? Mr. Luckcock no doubt will say, it was a singular coincidence of circumstances.

Then, as to the general doctrine of Divine influence or suggestion: objections seem to have arisen from mistakes or misrepresentations, confounding it with the miraculous gifts of the Spirit in the apostolic age, and which ceased soon after. But both

reason and revelation seem to point out a general assistance of the Deity in particular cases. "Deo juvante; Divina afflatu; Nil sine Jove; Jovis, omnia plena," were heathen maxims, which appear almost to be discarded by some modern Christians. But these influences are suasive and not compulsory, and therefore neither miraculous nor supernatural, for the mind of man may be regarded as a curious machine, consisting of various springs and movements, which in a certain degree act of themselves, though under the will and judgment of the individual; for we cannot while awake avoid thinking of something, but then we may generally direct our thoughts according to our choice, and the mind is excited to action by moral motives, and not by physical efficient. God is the great master of this machine; he originally furnished it with all its powers and capacities, and can easily diminish their exercise or stimulate and increase them. He can when he pleases (so to speak) press upon particular springs to promote his own wise purposes, in perfect consistence, nevertheless, with the original frame of the human mind, and with the accountability and proper character of a rational being.

A person sets out for a walk, but with no particular view, and at length feels a slight inclination to go into a certain district: when there, he saves a child from being run over; or, perhaps, sees a fire breaking out, is the first to give the alarm, and happily succeeds in preventing farther mischief. A pious man, under circumstances of unavoidable distress, applies to a friend, though with great doubts and hesitation, to lend him a certain sum of money. He supplicates the Deity, that if it be consistent with the plans of his providence, (for a Christian is not to pray for any temporal blessing absolutely, except for his daily bread,) his suit may succeed. At length he receives an answer fully equal to his wishes. Who shall decide here, whether in the former case, the determination was formed by a mere act of the will, without any particular motive, or by a secret suggestion, acting, not by chains and ropes, but by an unperceived inducement: and

particularly in the latter case, whether the desirable event was effected in the heart of this generous friend by the natural influence of the principle of benevolence originally impressed upon it by the broad seal of the Creator; cultivated and improved, and always ready for action upon suitable occasions; or, by a divine suggestion, pressing more strongly than usual upon this particular spring, and by a morally irresistible impulse, fixing the resolution of the benefactor? However, in either view, as before hinted, the beneficiary can scarcely avoid referring all to Providence, as to a sensible interference in his behalf, and as a favourable answer to his prayers.

Prayer itself is founded in the belief of a Providence; for to what end do we pray to an unseen power, but that we believe he is able and willing to help us? And not to enter into the historical parts of the Bible, which would carry us too far, we may safely assert, that both its history and its precepts inculcate the doctrine, not only of an ever-present, but also, though language is inadequate to the exalted idea, of an ever-active Intelligence. He is "a God near at hand, and not a God afar off." And we are encouraged to the most strenuous exertions in the path of duty by this animating motive, that it is "God that worketh in us, both to will and to do." Thus, divine and human agency are represented as perfectly consistent, and by these incitements, without any miracle, or unconditional favouritism. "Many things may be prevented, that otherwise would be, and many brought about that otherwise would not."*

Your correspondent quotes *Solomon*, "All things come alike to all," and thinks to put us off with the literal sense. Writers of "the New Light" should be the last persons in the world in capping texts, and supposing a literal sense, when such a sense is absurd, and contrary to fact; especially when they are continually attacking the Calvinists upon this score. We all know that this is an elliptical mode of speech very common

* Woollaston, Addison, Clarke, Baxter, Watts, Foster, &c. &c.

with the sacred writers, and that we must supply the sense thus:—"All things" frequently "come alike to all." "There is" sometimes "one event to the righteous and to the wicked." So again, "The race is not" *always* "to the swift, nor the battle to the strong;" but, in general, the contrary is the fact. Thus the modern Necessarians quote a passage in Isaiah, by a strange coincidence, in the same sense with the Calvinists: "Is there any evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it? I form peace, and create evil;" but this the context shews to relate to natural evil; and no doubt the sentiment is just in that view; because nothing can happen to states or individuals, which is beyond the Divine controul, and which he cannot overrule or restrain. Or if they will contend that it relates to moral evil also, St. James shall answer them: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God, for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man."

To conclude: let the advocates of free inquiry defend the doctrine of the simple Unity of the Deity, and of the true and proper humanity of our Saviour, and also enforce all the moral and scriptural arguments, (guarding them against abuse,) for the final salvation of all mankind. Here, they stand upon a rock, from which the darts of infidelity, and (as we conceive) of mistaken orthodoxy, will ultimately recoil. But the offices of Christ, in the great work of redemption, are "not of private interpretation;" every man should endeavour to form the best ideas upon these points that he is able; but no one has a right to impose his own sense upon his neighbour. And this rule is applicable to those serious Christians who think they can discover the pre-existence of our Lord in the sacred volume. But, above all things, let the persons we are speaking of be cautious, though with the best intentions, of attempting to undermine principles which have stood the test of ages, and which have appeared to the wisest and best of men perfectly consistent with the severest reason and judgment, with the nature of things, and "the analogy of the faith," till they shall have something better to give us in their room.

I. L.

Birmingham,

September 2, 1823.

SIR,

I HAVE given all the attention in my power to the statement in the Repository by Mr. Turner, (pp. 399—405,) in reply to my observations on a Particular Providence, as connected with the Memoirs of Mrs. Cappe, (pp. 163—167), without being able to perceive that I have "singularly misconceived" the doctrine, "as it is maintained by the excellent person who is the subject of these remarks;" and, of course, I cannot admit that my "reasoning is founded on a false and gratuitous assumption." I do not mean to assert that the opinions entertained by Mrs. C. may not have been similar to those of Mr. T., but I request my readers will bestow a glance upon my quotation from the Memoirs, and form their own opinion as to which of the two disputants assumes the most. I take the passage as I find it, without any reference to what I suppose may have been her more extended opinions: and it certainly appears to my apprehension, that if there be any meaning in language, any ideas that words can express with something like the perspicuity of correct and definite precision, she has accomplished what she intended in communicating her sentiments. I am well aware of the extreme difficulty in finding words and expressions that shall not be liable to objections. No language can supply an exact picture of the mind and feelings; and we must make a suitable allowance for imperfections, to which no person could be insensible who ever took up his pen to reason on any abstract subject; and more especially on this which is so entirely ideal, and out of the reach of demonstration. Mrs. C., for instance, uses the words *happened* and *accidentally*, not because she considered them as philosophically correct; but because there will inevitably subsist a discrepancy between the nice distinctions the mind perceives, and those of which oral or written speech is incapable. When we have made the nearest approaches we can, so as to render ourselves intelligible to each other, we should be satisfied, and not look for perfection where we shall never attain it. I, therefore, shall lay no stress upon these or similar expressions in her statement, nor at-

tempt to take any advantage of what may appear to me to be incorrect in her mode of expression. I willingly yield to Mr. T. the palm for logical acumen and definition; I only wish to argue for truth and not for victory. I am no polemic, and perhaps may by some be considered as a busy intruder in the literary republic: be that as it may, I claim the right of rambling in the field of inquiry, and the same liberty I most ardently consent that others should enjoy. I have early in life read Hartley, Hume, Stewart, Helvetius, Price, and other writers on the human mind, and the conclusions I drew from this mass of inquiry were, that I must judge for myself; and that if I pinned my faith upon the sleeve of any individual indiscriminately, I was as likely to be wrong as if I had no such literary authority whatever. I revere their powers of mind, and I give them credit for sincerity; but, after all, I believe common sense to be the best touchstone of opinions and practical merit.

Mrs. C. says, "It was the *intention* of a gracious Providence by these means, at that time, to preserve my life." Now, what are we to understand by the word "*intention*"? To my conception, it implies the result of choice or deliberation. Thus, if this event is permitted to take place, "all the salutary convictions will be felt, which similar dangers and similar deliverances are intended to produce;" if it is not permitted, then those consequences will be lost—*therefore*, it shall proceed. If this be not a *special* or *miraculous interference* for the particular purpose, there must surely be an end to all attempt at argument: or, at any rate, is it possible, after mature consideration, to deny that such was her view of the subject? That the effect was produced by what we agree to understand by a combination of natural causes, I admit; but I cannot separate the idea from the conclusion, that she believed that these natural causes or agents were purposely and specially appointed by Providence for the case in point. And am I not right in believing that her opinion was, that though these events were apparently trivial and unconnected, taken distinctly, and in their regular series; yet that the arrangement and combination of them was produced

in her favour by the special "*intention*" of Providence? It was well for the community that so valuable a life should be protracted to a ripe old age; but what had this event, taking it throughout, to do with prolonging it? Her death did not then take place; and to say that her life was prolonged by these agencies "that are often employed to take away life or to restore it, at the very moment when it is about to expire," appears to me a strange and incomprehensible confusion of ideas. In short, I think myself fully warranted in the conclusion, that the passage I quoted at full length gives me no authority to extend her conceptions of an overruling Providence beyond those of kind and beneficent protection.

I very readily acknowledge that I did not know from whence my quotation was taken, "one event," &c. I borrowed it solely from recollection. Mr. T. indirectly, and somewhat exultingly, asks, whether I am competent to undertake a commentary on the book which contains the passage? Most assuredly I am not; but this I can tell him, that when he shall be prepared to explain all the gradations which the sacred volume contains between plenary inspiration and acknowledged interpolations, I will take care to be ready, so that we may both enter the arena together.

I come now to Mr. T.'s explanation of the plans and proceedings of Providence; and if I understand him right, it is his opinion, that all possible events, moral as well as physical, were distinctly and separately appointed by Omniscience from the creation of the world, or from the profound and inconceivable depths of eternity. He nevertheless appears somewhat unwilling to admit an unlimited investigation into the subject, and afraid of the consequences of pursuing the argument to its extremes, lest we should be misled by "minute particularities," and lose sight of general principles. It must, however, in my estimation, be a weak cause that will not bear an examination in all its points; and if some of them should be more vulnerable than others, a disputant is fairly authorized to make his attack wherever it suits him best. By tracing objections to their utmost extent we frequently may arrive at indisputable

conclusions; or, at least, may prove that the arguments of our opponents will fail them in what they may consider as fundamental data. Such, for instance, as the doctrine of future punishment for moral depravity;—it appears consistent with all our preconceived principles of justice, that vice should be made to suffer for its turpitude; but when we attempt to vindicate eternal resentment and infinite misery as the retribution for finite errors and crimes, the reflecting mind must recoil with horror at the idea, and feel at once that no argument can establish such a monstrous proposition. Again, from dubious and apparently contradictory passages in the Old and New Testament, we may contend till doomsday about the person and offices of Christ; but when the assertion is made that the God of universal nature died on the cross—it is in vain to urge another word with such an opponent—there is no common principle of mind or language which is not thereby violated beyond the power of argument to restore.

To apply this reasoning to the doctrine of what is understood by the term of a Particular Providence, as advocated by Dr. Price and Mr. T.—and to me it appears capable of proving that it is inconsistent even with their own statement and explanation. If, as Mr. T. contends, “Every thing which has happened, or is to happen in the universe, was immediately contemplated by the Divine mind, and formed from the beginning an essential part of the general plan; that every individual entered separately and distinctly into the views of his Creator; that not merely our existence, not merely our welfare in general, but every moment’s existence, even the minutest circumstance which ministers to our welfare, was foreseen and provided for before time commenced his course: it also follows, that the execution, as well as the original design, is in the hands of the same great and wise Being, and that in every event that happens we behold the *immediate exertion* of divine power.” Admitting this to correspond with the sentiments held by Dr. Price, then the Doctor is quoted as saying that to suppose otherwise, “then the universe is a chaos; the character of the Parent of it is imperfect; all trust

in him, and all supplications to him are absurd, and no part of practical religion has any good foundation.” I venerate the talents, the virtues and the memory of the Doctor, and respect the character of Mr. T., but I must not implicitly bow to their or any other authority; and with this feeling, the conclusions I draw from their own premises are diametrically opposite.

If every possible case in the natural world is under the “*immediate exertion*” of the Deity—then every atom of the universe has been operated upon from its first existence, by absolute and temporary volition; and in all its future combinations and chemical affinities and changes, it must wait the Almighty fiat before it can fulfil its decrees. What, then, is the human frame but part of the great and sublime mystery of universal organization, composed of primeval atoms, and acted upon by the same universal agencies? Not to enter into the metaphysical contentions about Materialism, as it relates to a future state of existence, it will not be denied, on Mr. T.’s hypothesis, that the present state of the human mind derives its hopes, its passions, its powers and capabilities from the organization of the tenement with which it is connected; that external causes influence every emotion of the heart, and regulate, if not absolutely controul, every opinion of the intellect; that certain relations will produce the same corresponding results, as well in the moral as in the physical world. But is there no difference between general, immutable and eternal laws, and *immediate agency*? If every thought and action of an intelligent being is the consequence of the *immediate exertion* of some power independent of his own choice or will, what can remain that should dignify him in any degree with the character of a free agent? And how can this be called a state of trial and probation—subjecting him to future reward or punishment according to his deserts; when every atom of his frame, every combination of external circumstances, and every impulse of his mind, was imposed upon him by an eternal decree, and altogether irresistible? Is this the “good foundation for practical religion”? What I understand by

religion, is the devotion of every faculty of body and mind to the performance of those duties we consider essential to the approbation of heaven—with the hope that future happiness will be the reward. But if all free agency is a mere delusion; if we are invariably the passive and helpless agents of appointed purposes, what then becomes of accountability? Are not the terms merit and demerit absolutely merged and confounded—and is it not upon this footing alone “that all supplications to the Deity are absurd”? If petitions are meant to influence the Divine mind either to perpetuate or to change his eternal purposes; how more than useless, how presumptuous must they appear! and for what other purpose can they be presented?

In the eternal and immutable designs of Providence, as connected with the human race, it is utterly in vain for us to attempt to fathom his counsels, so as to explain the origin of evil, or why its continuance should be permitted. I like the reasoning upon that subject of your correspondent Mr. Hinton, in your Number for July. All inferiority implies imperfection; and as all creation, material and intellectual, must necessarily be inferior to its great and original Creator; it must, consequently, partake of some qualities, both physical and moral, which our limited views lead us to express by the term evil. That convulsions in the natural world produce many beneficial consequences, the most casual observation cannot overlook. What we can trace is sufficient to prove unity of design, and general benevolence of purpose; and we have no possible reason to doubt that the intellectual government of all sentient beings is under the same wise and immutable appointment. The natural impulse of the human heart appears to be gratitude for the blessings with which we are surrounded, and confidence in the protection of the benevolence which has brought us into being, with the capacity to enjoy its bounties, and to anticipate and trust in its future provision. The light of nature teaches us that the best expression of gratitude is obedience, and that we are accountable for our conduct to the power which gave us our existence. This feeling, if indulged, will influence

every action of our lives and every principle of our minds, and is equally intelligible to the understanding of all mankind. What then is gained, or rather what an immense power, over the conduct of the human race is not surrendered, by the belief that we are all mere machines in the dark round of fixed and irretrievable fate; and that we are forced by external impulses to blunder through the bewildering perplexities of life, with no more responsibility than the unconscious and unreflecting brutes! Are not these the only rational conclusions that can be drawn from the opinions I am attempting to controvert; and if so, do they not fatally undermine all belief in revelation? For, to what purpose can revelation be applied, but to teach mankind their duties and obligations? And what is duty detached from honourable and voluntary service; or what merit is there in the mechanical performance of an automaton? As well may we talk of the duties of a steam-engine or of a mousetrap. I do not wish to speak irreverently or with derision on the subject; but if it will not bear even this severe and extreme test, it must surely be defective. Who then is chargeable as “a fallible mortal in presuming to explain away the express words of our Lord, and set limits to the Divine Omniscience”? For is there a page in the whole of the New Testament but what contains a forcible appeal to the understanding and feelings of the reader; that he has the liberty of making his own choice between good and evil; and that he will be rewarded or punished for the proper or improper use of the privilege?

The popular acceptance of the word providential, is in exact accordance with what I have understood to be Mrs. C.'s opinion, that is, a *merciful interposition*; but how partial and unsuitable is the term, and even how upbraiding is its application, if we are to presume to make these invidious distinctions! We thank Providence for those events that gratify our self-love, and withhold our general ascriptions of praise for his universal beneficence. “Wha at sic a time can praise the Lord?” is an exclamation which a favourite modern author has put into the mouth of a half idiot, in the midst of a tremendous storm; and

the feeling is correct upon half matured and imperfect principles. Whereas, on a more enlarged and just view of the subject, our best emotions are expanded to higher strains of thanksgiving for every tie which binds us to universal nature, whatever to us individually may be its temporary and seeming hardships and imperfections. That the usual expressions of the belief in the partial interference of Providence in the concerns of individuals, are almost exclusively limited to benefits received, is obvious. Upon the hypothesis of Mr. T. we ought not to make these distinctions, but either refrain from such expressions altogether, or refer every possible case to the same wise and merciful appointment. But what a horrid sense of profanation and impiety would be excited, should it be said, that providentially Eve tasted the forbidden fruit; or Cain slew his brother Abel; or the Israelites worshiped their golden calf! Or, to come nearer to our own concerns, would not the indignation of the civil powers, as well as the ecclesiastical authorities, be let loose upon any one who should say, that providentially Copenhagen was bombarded by its friends; or the Manchester massacres took place; or the slaughter, in cold blood, of 500 Arabs at Hydrabad by the bayonets of Englishmen? That providentially, A turned highwayman, B lost his estate by gaming, and C destroyed himself? Would such expressions be endured? Yet are they not unavoidable inferences, however unguarded and irreverent they may appear? And do they not shew the extreme hazard of speculating in these opinions beyond the power of penetration allotted to us by our Maker? Should I be accused of impiety in the rashness of these queries, why should such a case as the following pass uncensured? If I have any just conceptions of inconsiderate or presumptuous folly, it surely was here displayed. The public papers informed us of a fire having taken place in London, and destroyed the offices of a copper-plate printer, who was known to have had in his possession the large engraving representing the coronation of George IV., but though most of the other plates entrusted to his care were lost, "yet providentially this one escaped."

As one of the inconsistencies attached to Mrs. C.'s opinions, I cannot refrain from mentioning another passage in her Memoirs, which struck me as sadly encroaching upon the commonest feelings of humanity, and highly derogatory to the justice and goodness of the Universal Parent. She says, "When we read in the Mosaic dispensations of the severe denunciations against the Canaanites, and other neighbouring nations, for worshiping the false deities of human device, we are apt to think that the punishment was more than commensurate to the offence; but when we contemplate, even in our own times, a period of so much greater light and knowledge, the miseries still inflicted and endured by superstition and idolatry, on the wretched inhabitants of those countries which know not God; when we cast our eyes on the temple of Jugernaut, and see the fires kindled to consume the frantic widow of Indostan; when we try to enumerate the dreadful list of horrid enormities which owe their origin to these debasing superstitions; surely we must confess, that even the command of *complete extermination*, harsh as it may appear, was issued in *mercy* by Him 'who seeth the end from the beginning,' not merely to the unhappy idolaters themselves, to save them from plunging deeper and still deeper into sin and misery, but as a solemn warning to neighbouring nations, to thousands and tens of thousands, who would have been corrupted by their pernicious example, and have perpetuated the dreadful evil from generation to generation." Gracious heaven! extermination for what? For ignorance; and by whom? By those who, having had superior information, were perpetually plunging into the same idolatry themselves!! It is recorded of Pizarro, (I think,) that having requested a friendly interview with an Indian cacique, and the most distinguished persons of his empire, a recommendation of the doctrines of Christianity was submitted to them, with the assertion that the Bible, which was put into the hands of the chief, gave the information of the whole. The cacique examined it seriously, and put it to his ear as if expecting it would speak; but being disappointed, and fearful, perhaps, that it possessed

some secret charm which would injure him, he let it fall with the timidity of alarm. Spaniards! Christians! exclaimed the fanatic Pizarro, will you see your holy religion thus insulted, the word of God trampled on by a Pagan? Revenge! Revenge! and prove yourselves worthy of the protection of heaven! A general massacre ensued: and is there in the black catalogue of human crimes, a fact which holds a stronger claim upon our bitterest execration?

The infamous tribunal of the Inquisition is said to have caused between the years 1481 and 1759, 34,658 persons to be burnt alive, and between 1481 and 1808, to have sentenced 288,214 to the galleys or to be imprisoned.* If to these we add the ruthless persecutions over a great part of the world, which had no connexion with the Inquisition; and the bloody, infuriated and numerous national wars undertaken and continued under the prostituted name of religion or Christianity; we must be compelled to admit, that, detestable as were many of the Heathen institutions, and sanguinary as were many of their practices; yet that Christians (nominal Christians) have infinitely exceeded them all in atrocity, and sacrificed more victims in one century, than the Canaanites or Hindoos would have done in twenty. It appears to have been the general opinion of the ancient Pagan world, that every kingdom or community had its proper and stationary gods, so that when any conquest took place, the invaders adopted the mythology of the conquered as a matter of course; it was reserved for enlightened times, and for the followers of the "Prince of Peace," to make war upon each other for mere opinions, and to preach *extermination* in the name of the "God of mercy."

Whatever may be the errors of the Mahometans respecting their partial acknowledgment of Christ and the person of their own prophet, they certainly have more correct notions of the unity of the Godhead, than the great majority of the Christian world. They plead for his simple and undivided essence; whereas as long as we

use the word *Trinity*, we must by them be considered as involving the subject in perplexity and doubt, however we may varnish over our own interpretations. If, then, the Israelites were selected by the Almighty as his chosen people to perpetuate the knowledge of his Unity; at least the Mahometans are entitled to share this praise; and, coupling this merit with the atrocities and abominations committed in the name of Christianity, we should, to preserve our consistency on the theory of Mrs. Cappe, petition heaven to issue its "commands" to the followers of Mahomet to extirpate the believers in Christ from the face of the globe.

But in the case of the Canaanites it is said, that it was the command of Him "who seeth the end from the beginning." I know but of one rule of justice, and I dare not charge Omnipotence with its violation, viz., that retribution should be in exact proportion to the desert. We may swerve from this precept through inattention, prejudice, or misapprehension; but do not let us attempt to vindicate in the Almighty what the noblest and best feelings of our nature proclaim it would be wrong in us to commit. "Where there is no law there can be no crime;" and to punish as an "offence" what could not possibly be avoided, and to call it "mercy," too! Venerable shade of departed excellence! however thy virtuous mind might heretofore be shaded with imperfection, bear witness now to the correctness of the views for which I am an humble advocate; that man is endowed with faculties which he can voluntarily either debase or improve; that he has the option either "to bury his talent in the earth," or to extend it a hundred fold; that more will not be required of him than has been bestowed; and that if perfectibility be denied to his limited powers, it is his bounden duty never to lose sight of the splendid and animating goal, as it is his high privilege that he shall succeed in proportion to his endeavours.

Such are a part of the anomalies which present themselves to my imagination, either with the limited views which I have supposed to be entertained by Mrs. C., or the more extended ones of Mr. T., and such

* Histoire Abrégée de l'Inquisition.

must they ever remain with many additions, while, not satisfied with general principles, we must seek for a solution of difficulties of our own creating, and be prying into those inscrutable dispensations of Providence, which, being totally beyond the reach of our intelligence, it is folly to attempt to scrutinize. I do not presume to say that no such difficulties exist on the hypothesis of a general Providence, but I believe them to be neither so numerous nor so insuperable as the other side of the argument affords. In either case the subject is much too abstruse to authorize such short-sighted mortals as we are to arrogate to ourselves the delusive pretensions to infallibility. As Mr. T. has passed unnoticed what I consider as the most important bearing on the question, I wish here to be allowed most strenuously to repeat it, viz. the doctrine of individual and universal responsibility for every being endued with the powers of reflection, and the fears or hopes connected with futurity. It is the safest side of the question; it appears to have the common consent of all mankind; it is the invariable language of revelation; it cannot exist with the tenets advocated by my opponents; and if Pope was not the soundest philosopher, he was the most practical moralist when he describes Providence by its operations:

"Who binding nature fast in fate,
Left free the human will."

Mr. T. may accuse me of presumption; but to which of the two will the epithet most closely apply—I, who seek not to dive into the inscrutable dispensations of Omniscience, who adore its attributes, and acknowledge my unbounded and happy confidence in its universal regulations and appointments; or he, who, not satisfied with this, must undertake to explain what must to finite beings be incomprehensible? He may taunt me by saying, that in Mrs. C.'s statement of her particular case, I find "*only a fit subject for ridicule.*" This charge I repel with a conscious feeling of not deserving it. Here he is unguarded, and if he should think well to continue the controversy through the same channel, I think myself entitled to the acknowledg-

ment of indiscretion. I have no objection to a little pungent seasoning in a controversy, but it should be kept strictly within the line of civility and truth. To trifle with such a subject, is, I can truly assure him, as far from my intention as it can be from his; and the utmost I meant to express, was, that I thought she had ventured to expose herself to the charge from other quarters.

Here then I take my leave of the subject and of Mr. T. A volunteer in the cause of truth and virtue, a favourable opportunity seemed to challenge my pen to oppose what I considered an error calculated to produce more mischief than good; and at the same time it served to divert the current of my thoughts from another channel. Having thus stated my reasons, I must leave the dispute to the examination of those who may have the inclination to attend to the arguments advanced on either side. I regret that I never knew the worthy Mrs. Cappe: having nearly forty years ago had some intercourse with the family, it ended with placing them high in my estimation. And as to Mr. T., though personally unknown to each other, I freely extend my right hand in imagination half way to York, persuaded that he would not refuse me the ideal grasp of good fellowship.

JAMES LUCKCOCK.

P. S. I have hastily glanced over the remarks on Mr. Owen's plan by your correspondent Philadelphus, (pp. 450—457,) and though they contain many ideas I cannot approve, yet the general philanthropy and good sense they display deserve in my opinion more of the public attention than the imperfect sanction of an anonymous signature is likely to impart. No real name can be so insignificant as a fictitious one.

Tenterden,
August 28, 1823.

SIR,

AT the united request of the Unitarian Baptist congregation at Cranbrook, I here take the liberty of bringing their situation again under the notice of the Unitarian body in general. They have assuredly been for some time labouring under great difficulties and discouragements, but

they by no means consider them as insurmountable. They admit that applications of this nature are numerous and urgent, but still hope for the assistance of that enlightened and most liberal body of Christians with whom they are connected.

Allow me then to give the following statement of their present circumstances. The debt upon the Chapel is still 700*l.*, but by their own exertions and engaged assistance on the part of some friends, a list of whom with their subscriptions is now before me, they have it in their power to reduce it below 400*l.*, as the sum of 311*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.* is already at their command. This is in proof that they are in earnest, and most anxious to support the sacred cause in which we are all embarked, and still to enjoy the advantages and blessings of a pure and conscientious worship in the place in which they have for many years been accustomed to meet. I am requested to state that the above sum of 311*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.* is engaged for, on condition that the society succeed in their appeal to the liberality of the Unitarian public in carrying it up to 700*l.*, and thus setting them free from the above pressure. Nor will any subscriptions be called for till the whole shall be subscribed. It is also an act of justice to the mortgagee to state here that his subscription is 100*l.*

Could the above be happily accomplished, the society will then find themselves at liberty for the necessary future exertions, and a regular or stated ministry might in no distant period be established among them. But if they unhappily fail, the property must of course be disposed of, and the society be possibly dispersed—a society once flourishing, and who were then ever ready to extend to others, in circumstances of pressure, their friendly aid.

LAWRENCE HOLDEN.

SIR,

August 25, 1823.

THE following reflections were suggested by the perusal of a paper in the Monthly Repository for July, (pp. 378—380,) on “the Introduction of Evil,” and are chiefly applicable to the proposition which the author evidently considers as incontrovertible, that “it is not in

the possible power of Infinity itself to create a being not subject to moral and natural ill,” or, as he afterwards explains it, to pain and misery.

How far your correspondent Mr. Hinton’s claim to *novelty* in his speculations is well founded, I will not stop to inquire; but I should imagine that those who are acquainted with the pages of Archbishop King, Soame Jenyns, and Dr. Southwood Smith, on this difficult question, will not feel disposed to make so ample a concession as he may consider either himself or *Rusticus* (p. 85) entitled to receive.

If the origin of evil is to be ascribed solely to the inability of the Deity to create an equal; if liability to error and misery must necessarily attach to every being not absolutely perfect; then it follows that intelligences of the highest order, “angels and arch-angels, and all the company of heaven,” must be subject to the danger of erroneous conduct, and all its fatal consequences; and what is still more material, that the state of the righteous hereafter will be a state of uncertainty and peril. The unalloyed felicity which they are taught to expect after the present life, cannot, on this supposition, be permanently ensured to them, because it is utterly impossible that their Almighty Benefactor can make them his equals; and they who have been exalted to a condition of bliss, of which we can now form no adequate conception, may possibly in after ages forfeit that elevation, and sink as low in the abyss of wretchedness and horror. With such sentiments let it be observed, the popular creed rejected by the Unitarians respecting the fate of the *fallen angels*, is perfectly in unison. Should it be said, however, that the Deity having promised an eternity of happiness to those who have rendered themselves worthy of it, will assuredly adhere to his promise, I answer that, according to the doctrine advocated by Mr. H., since the Supreme Ruler cannot work impossibilities, all the energies of Omnipotence will not enable him to give unlimited duration to that happiness which, however exalted, must, from the imperfection of his creatures, be ever liable to interruption and failure. If, again, it is alleged that he may

nevertheless prolong this state of felicity by repeated renewals, and fresh exertions of his power, I reply, that had it been his will he might by the frequent exertion of the same power have perpetuated such a state *from the beginning*, and might if consistent with his wisdom have rendered permanent by the same means, such a concurrence of moral circumstances as would in the *first instance* have prevented the wrong volitions of his rational creatures. In short, if it was impossible for the Divine Being to prevent the intrusion of evil into his works at any one period, it will be equally impossible at all times; for no improvements in the human mind, no future expedients adopted in the counsels of the Most High, can ever diminish the absurdity of supposing him capable of communicating to his creatures his own infinite and adorable attributes.

This cause, therefore, I confess, does not appear to me to afford a satisfactory solution of the difficulty in question. Where a gradation of intelligent creatures is the system adopted, and this we have reason to suppose is the only one consistent with optimism, the evils arising from imperfection must unavoidably exist; but surely the evils proceeding solely from this source, if, indeed, they deserve that name, may easily be imagined to take place, without the necessity of those dreadful ills to which human life is at present subject. The mere negation of higher privileges and blessings may well consist both with the benevolence of the great Parent of nature, and with the happiness of his offspring; and, indeed, I am at a loss to conceive why limited attributes are incapable of subsisting with no other ills than those of imperfection, which may be comparatively insignificant, or why they should be altogether incompatible with an exemption from moral and physical evils, in the common acceptance of those terms. The supposition, that the misery of the human race, in all the multifarious forms which it daily assumes, could not possibly be prevented in the original formation of the world, must inevitably impress the mind with degrading ideas of the attributes of the Supreme Being, and present the most

gloomy view of his superintending providence. According to this comfortless theory, the man who is called to endure the exacerbations of some incurable disease, or who is sinking under the destructive oppression of mental anguish, has no other consolation than the reflection that infinite benevolence, though aided by infinite power, could not have prevented the infliction of those ills, and, what is more, can afford no security against their recurrence.

Admitting, however, the impossibility of excluding the tortures of body and distraction of mind incident to the species, created as they were with so much inherent imperfection, we may still venture to ask why creative power should proceed so low in the scale of existence, and why it should not have been confined to those parts in the series, of which the unavoidable imperfection does not imply any excess of misery. If the lower ranks in the descending gradation could not be created without subjecting them to the tremendous liability here supposed, may we not inquire, without impiety, in what consisted the necessity of creating them at all? Non-existence must be infinitely preferable to a continued preponderance of pain; and there can be no imaginable cause, therefore, for the creation of so inferior a being as man, except the communication of happiness. If, then, on the one hand, it be affirmed that the overwhelming evils to which some part of the human race are subject could not be prevented, and cannot be remedied, is not the original purpose of the Creator defeated, and the most glorious of his attributes rendered abortive? On the other hand, if it be alleged that the miseries of which we are speaking *can* be remedied, then I should contend, that allowing the author of them to be possessed of infinite power, they might with equal ease have been altogether avoided.

It seems to be an opinion authorized by the creed of almost every denomination of Christians, that the imperfections of the human race are so numerous and so predominant, that by far the greater part of the species will fail in securing the ultimate felicity promised to the obedient; and hence, if the first supposition be true, that

liability to misconduct, and the evils resulting from it were inevitable, the inference will be, that the majority of mankind were created, (as every Supralapsarian Calvinist really believes,) with the full purpose of their becoming interminably wretched; for no other motive could operate to call them into existence.

There are, however, persons of more enlightened understandings, and less gloomy temperaments, who consider the natural and moral evils by which we are now surrounded, to be all capable of effectual remedy, and who believe that every order of rational intelligences will be ultimately and completely happy. They admit, indeed, that the evils of imperfection are the necessary results of creation itself, and particularly in a system which consists of a subordination of ranks; but since they perceive that in the human species, though all created with the same liability, many individuals are exempt from those dreadful maladies of body and mind to which others are subject, they naturally conclude that these calamities might have been originally avoided, and that, consequently, they are ordained for some wise and benevolent purpose, and which, in truth, can be no other than because they will contribute to render the aggregate sum of felicity greater than it would have been on any other conceivable plan. Why pain should be made essentially instrumental in the production of enjoyment, is a mysterious question, which it is not within the circumscribed powers of man to solve; but that moral and physical evils are, in fact, subservient to great and useful purposes, cannot be doubted by those who have paid any attention to the subject of these remarks.

Among the various hypotheses which have been framed to account for the admission of moral evil into the world, there are four only that in the eye of the modern philosopher can be deemed worthy of regard. While some speculatists are of opinion, as we have just seen, that its admission could not have been prevented, even by Omnipotence, as long as imperfect beings are brought into existence, others maintain, (and this is the most prevalent belief,) that it must be attributed to the abuse of

that freedom of the will with which man is endowed as an accountable creature. A third scheme has been proposed by an acute but a fanciful writer, who is better known to the world by his remarks on the internal evidences of Christianity. He contends, that since natural evil was unavoidable, it was necessary, in order to prevent its being inflicted on the innocent, that some persons should be brought into existence, who, by their misconduct, would contract moral depravity, and who would, on that account, merit the misery which it was impossible to exclude altogether from the creation. The last, and, in my opinion, the most satisfactory explanation of the difficulty before us, represents both *moral* as well as natural evil, as *appointed* by the Supreme Being, with the sole view of producing a greater sum of good than could otherwise take place, and teaches us to believe, that by the ultimate restoration of the whole human race to virtue and happiness, evil, in all its numberless and terrific forms, will finally and eternally vanish.

A most formidable objection to the three first of these hypotheses is, that since the ultimate prevalence of unmixed happiness cannot be deduced from them, it follows that with regard to a large proportion of mankind, it would have been better for them that they should not have been born. But if the last can be established, there is no human being to whom the communication of existence will not in the end have been an inestimable blessing, and the divine attributes will be at once vindicated from those degrading conceptions which it is impossible on any other scheme not to entertain.

It is not improbable that your correspondent Mr. H. may hold the doctrine of universal restoration, but it is difficult to say how he can reconcile it with the belief that it is beyond the efficacy of Omnipotence itself to exempt inferior beings not only from *liability* to miscalculation, fallibility and error, but from the *moral certainty* of feeling their effects.

CLERICUS CANTABRIGIENSIS.

Stapleton, near Bristol,
Sept. 4, 1823.

SIR,

IN reply to the remarks of your correspondent Mr. Eaton, in your last Number, (p. 465,) upon the subject of my communication, on "the Introduction of Evil," in your Number for July last, (pp. 378—380,) I beg leave to state, that he is mistaken in supposing that in proposing my hypothesis, which asserts that evil is the necessary inheritance of all created intelligences, and that every being not infinite must be liable to error and evil, I had not "foreseen or provided for a consequence of the greatest magnitude," which results from it (i. e.) the existence of evil in heaven itself. The fact is, that I had in the original composition comprising this hypothesis both foreseen and asserted this inference, and in the conclusion of my letter to you on this subject I gave an intimation, that "there were some other inferences drawn from the foregoing hypothesis which I did not think necessary to set forth," and the necessary existence of evil in a future state formed one of these suppressed inferences: my reason for suppressing which, was the fear that it might shock minds unused to metaphysical inquiries, and thus with many other novel truths do injury upon its first promulgation, although I am fully persuaded that every truth, however shocking to existing prejudices, must eventually produce good. I did not, however, wish to risk the production even of temporary injury, if it could be avoided; but our worthy friend having now forced this inference to come unwillingly from its concealment, I will give it in the words in which it stands in the original composition, and shall fearlessly enter on its justification, as I am not in the habit of shrinking from any conclusion whatever to which truth appears to lead (i. e.):

"4thly.* The foregoing hypothesis

* Another of these suppressed inferences proves, that the universe must necessarily have bounds, because it is a creature, and every creature can possess only limited attributes; and corrects some philosophical expressions and modes of speech, by shewing that though many things surpass our calculation and conception, nothing can possibly be infinite

shews that though the perfection of the righteous in a future state may be far more exalted than perhaps even the highest created intelligence can now possibly conceive, yet must it fall short of *infinite* perfection, which belongs alone to God; since the attributes of created intelligences can never become infinite by future glorification, though thereby they will doubtless be matured and improved far beyond all present calculation or conception. Some small degree of alloy must be admitted, since it is contrary to the hypothesis upon which these inferences are drawn, that any created intelligence can exist without some portion of evil; although the portion of evil which may then be necessary by its counteraction to produce pleasure, may be so almost infinitely refined, as not at present to be capable of conception, as distinct from purity and bliss: and thus constitute the highest happiness of which created beings can possibly be susceptible."

Mr. Eaton's feelings are alarmed, as I confess mine were, when this last inference first arose in my mind, at the thought of casting "a doubt upon the *unmixed* happiness promised to the righteous;" but if that gentleman will keep strictly in view the principle on which my hypothesis founds the existence of happiness, and "justifies the ways of God to man," in the unavoidable existence of evil, he will find that his objection will cease; since it will appear that not only all creation, but that all happiness, is necessarily inseparable from evil; that evil is alike essential to the production of both; that pleasure could not possibly exist without its contrast—pain and anxiety; that it is indeed their legitimate offspring; and that it is beyond the power of infinity itself to produce it without their agency, in minds constructed with limited attributes; since to produce happiness in such minds, change, fluctuation, counteraction and pursuit, causing the sensations of plea-

except God. And another of these inferences substantiates the mechanical nature of the human mind, and the doctrine of philosophical necessity; but your usually crowded columns forbid my transcribing them for insertion.

sure and pain, become indispensably necessary; and these effects can only arise from contending or opposite causes, one of which necessarily identifies itself with what we call *evil*. Mr. E. asks, "How can we be sure of enjoying (unalloyed) happiness or perfection in heaven itself? For when there, we shall still be created beings, and as finite then as we are now, consequently as liable to miscalculation, failure and error." Now, so far from being *sure* of unchangeable happiness in a future state, my hypothesis proves that it is only on the ground of our being *sure* that no such inactive stagnant happiness can exist, that we can expect any happiness there at all; since the happiness of all created beings necessarily supposes change, transition, fluctuation, pursuit, hope and fear, grounded of course upon contending or opposite causes, one of which must be evil, as two opposite and contending causes cannot both be of the same nature or principle.

Mr. E. overstrains the conclusion to be drawn from my hypothesis, in supposing that it implies, that we shall remain "*as finite then as now*, and *as liable* to miscalculation, failure and error," as we are at present; for though in heaven we shall assuredly remain "created beings and finite," and still "*liable* to miscalculation, failure and error," since both our existence and our happiness will be then, as they are now, inseparably and necessarily connected with these facts and liabilities; but the hypothesis by no means implies, that we shall be so liable to these things as now, nor *so* finite then as now, but the very contrary, inasmuch as it shews, that our mental powers will be astonishingly enlarged beyond what "eye hath seen or ear heard, or hath entered into the heart of man to conceive;" and in the measure in which they are so enlarged, and in proportion as we are enabled to perceive the consequences of our own conduct, and to secure the intended effects of our own designs, in that very proportion our happiness must increase. We have, indeed, a full example and illustration of this fact in the present life, since the wise and calculating avoid much more evil than the ignorant and unthinking: and could we now ascertain the exact proportion in which

that increase of knowledge would take place, the same rule would, I doubt not, shew us the exact increase of our happiness; and which may therefore be so far beyond our present conceptions, as to *appear* absolutely infinite, inasmuch as it defies our utmost calculation; but *infinite* it never can be for the reasons before assigned.

With respect to "unmixed happiness being promised to the righteous in the gospel," I would only observe, that it is impossible that any word in any language can be of such extensive and unlimited meaning, as to comprise the promise of *infinite* happiness, either in degree or duration, (and unmixed happiness can be no less than infinite,) since as language cannot exceed idea, and seldom, indeed, comes up to it; and as we have no idea whatever of infinity, all expressions in allusion to future bliss, as well as to future punishment, must have a relative or limited meaning; and can really mean no more than this—a longer time or higher degree than we can calculate: and that this is the case in the original languages of the Scriptures, I have often noticed; and, hence, have frequently found an advantage in argument with the assertors of endless torment, when they have urged that the Greek *αιωνος* implies endless duration, because it is used in reference to future happiness; and particularly that, in Matt. xxv. 46, *αιωνον* is used even in the same verse, in reference to happiness as well as to punishment; and, therefore, must have a like meaning in both cases, supposing, of course, that I should readily admit its endless meaning as to future happiness: but I have replied that this word in *neither* case signifies *endless* or *infinite*, either in duration, degree or nature, but only what its primitive signification imports, age-lasting or limited, or an indefinitely long period: and this is in perfect unison with the third as well as fourth inferences I have drawn from the hypothesis; the former of which denies the capacity of any creature to possess the attribute of immortality, and requires renewals of existence in a future state, to prolong it to an infinite period; and which faith in the goodness of the Almighty teaches us to rely upon. No

argument therefore can, I apprehend, be derived from the Scriptures, at all opposed to the inferences I have drawn.

I have endeavoured to procure a sight of Dr. Williams's Sermon, in which Mr. E. says there is something similar to my hypothesis, but in vain. It has just occurred to me, that there is, perhaps, something like it, in the old Heathen philosophy, which supposed that there was some intractability in nature, which God could not overcome; and, therefore, in creation could not dispense with evil, but made the best he could of his intractable materials. This, however, impiously supposed the Deity not to have been the Creator of the materials, out of which he fashioned the universe; and is, therefore, very different from that hypothesis, which merely points out certain effects necessarily attendant upon every creature, and which mark his inferiority to the Creator, by exhibiting the limited nature of his attributes.

I shall be most heartily sorry should my present communication hurt the pious impressions, or wound the future prospects of unchangeable happiness, of any who may be incapable of perceiving the genuine basis upon which happiness, both here and hereafter, appears to me to be founded: none will regret it more than I shall; but called upon as I am to justify my impressions, be assured no consequences will ever frighten me from the maintenance, or the legitimate conclusions of truth.

G. P. HINTON.

SIR,

I AM much obliged to your learned correspondent J. J. (pp. 465—467), for the indulgent manner in which he controverts my criticism on Gen. iv. 26. When inquirers have no other object but truth, they will agree to differ; and there will be no ground for any other feeling but candour and mutual esteem. I will revise this question on a future occasion: at present I shall only say that the version, "Then men began to call themselves by the name of Jehovah," is printed in the margin of a copy of an old edition of the Bible in my possession.

The paper on the Greek Accents (pp. 442—450) is evidently the production of an elegant scholar. The lovers of Greek literature must feel obliged to the author for bringing the subject before the readers of the Repository in so tangible a form. I will pay due attention to it; and T. F. B. may expect from me, through the same channel, a respectful reply to his positions.

I feel very grateful to the learned Gellius (pp. 457, 458) for the notice which he has taken of my Lexicon. His remarks are well calculated to draw to it the attention of the learned readers of the Repository, which was evidently his intention. I beg to make a few remarks on his notes. The article *δοξα*, in my Lexicon, is carelessly done. The general term "appearance," which implies "show" or "semblance," the sense it bears, as Gellius observes in Orestes, 235, ought to have been inserted. Lexicographers and critics have not sufficiently observed that a word, in a certain connexion, may have a meaning, which yet is foreign to the word itself. Thus *απαρχη*, as Gellius remarks, may mean the clippings of hair. But the appropriate sense of the term is first-fruits or offering; what the offering might be depends on the context; and it may denote wine or honey, as well as hair. Thus, also, *αφημι*, in general means to dismiss or put away; but its sense, in the context of Orestes, 115, coincides with the idea of "spilling or pouring out." But even there *αφει* would more exactly be expressed by "drop," i. e. drop as an offering on the grave.—*Καταγω* is a nautical term, signifying, to bring to land or into harbour, which, to prevent injury, is done with caution and gentleness. The master of a steam-boat standing up and calling, while advancing among the shippings to the landing-place, "Gently, gently," i. e. approach gently, would, it appears to me, convey the exact idea implied in the verb *καταγε*, *καταγε*, addressed by Electra to the chorus, who was afraid of disturbing Orestes, now reposing from his madness. When Gellius says that *αναπαλλω* means *to soar*, as in Orest. 316, he, with other critics, confounds this verb with *ανεπαλλω*, (*ανα*, *επι*, *αλλω*), which, in the active form, signifies *to cause to spring up, or to*

pounce upon. While in the passive its sense is *to spring up*. This verb, instead of *αναπαλλω*, (*ανα up*, and *παλλω to shake*,) *to brandish, to shake up*, should be restored to Bacch. 149, 1179, and Il. ψ, 692. This last verb, *αμπαλλειδ'*, (for *αναπαλλετε*,) is the true reading in Orestes, 316, and means, in a transitive sense, *to shake, or put in agitation*. The address is made to the *furies*; and the poet paints their intense thirst of vengeance by the effect of their sweeping pinions, in agitating the whole expanse of the atmosphere. Porson's note shews that he mistook the meaning and construction of the passage; and the authority of that great critic seems to have misled Gellius. In column 112 of my Lexicon, *αμπαλλω* is set down in the sense of *shaking*, with a reference to the line in question; but the erroneous reading in Beck's edition, which I use, caused me inadvertently to put it in the passive voice.

I smiled, not without feelings of complacency and gratitude, at the adroit and delicate manner in which Gellius palliates my glaring omission of *βαινω*, and its several branches. The cause of this omission was curious enough, though it is not worth while to occupy a paragraph in the Repository to state it. I discovered it a few days after the book was finished; but not before some copies of the work were dispersed. And it seems that the one in Gellius's possession was of that number, which escaped before the omission was supplied in the *Addenda*. I am sure that Gellius would think it right in me here to insert the omitted article, in order to remedy the prejudice of the statement which through inadvertence he has made. In the Literary Gazette there lately appeared an article on my Lexicon, which must have proceeded from one who, if not a friend to me, is at least a friend to Greek literature, and I beg leave to state the words of that critic. "We will illustrate these observations by one example. This shall be the common verb, *βαινω*; which, however, the reader will not find in its proper place in Dr. Jones's Lexicon, but among the *Addenda* at the end.—*Βαινω*, I go, march, proceed, Iτ. 1, 3—*go up*, climb, mount, ascend, Α. 2, 3.—*Go after*, follow, Il. κ. 149.—*Go to an enemy*, assail, attack, Il. ζ. 21.

—*Go by*, pass, go about a person to defend him, succour, Il. ρ. 510.—*Go away*, fly, depart, vanish, Il. ζ. 229, μ. 16.—*Go down*, descend, β. 167.—*Go through*, cross, Il. ζ. 343. *Imp.* *βαινον* for *εβαινον*, they mounted, embarked, Il. β. 511; *part.* *βαινων*, going near, approaching, Isthm. 2, 16.

"*βαιω*, *f.* *ησω*, I go, *aor.* 1, *εβησε*, he caused to mount or embark, Herod. 1, 80; *βησε*, he caused to come down, brought down, Il. ε. 164. Hence it appears that the first aorist of this verb has a transitive sense. So has *aor.* 1, *m.* *βησατο* for *εβησατο*, he mounted the chariot, Il. γ. 262; *fut.* 1. *βησω*, Ion. *βειω*, by inserting, 1, *βειω*, *ωφρα βειω*, while I shall go, Il. ζ. 113, *f.* 1, *m.*; *βησεται*, will go, will become of, Il. β. 339; *βασευνται*, Dor. for *βησονται*, they will go, Theo. 4, 26; *βησεται*, a new verb, hence the imperfect *βησετο*, for *εβησετο*, he mounted, Il. ε. 745; *βεομαι*, the Ionic form, will go on in life, Il. χ. 431, will go by the will of another, obey, shall be ruled by, Il. ο. 194; *perf.* *βεβηκε*, has gone, is accustomed to go, Isthm. 471; *pluper.* *βεβηκει* for *εβεβηκει*, had gone, was gone, went, Il. π. 856; *perf. m.* *βεβασι*, *contr.* *βεβασι*, have passed, are gone, Il. β. 134; *inf.* *βεβαεναι*, *βεβαναι*, *βεβαμεν*, to go about, defend, protect him, Il. ρ. 510; *βημι*, *aor.* 2, *εβην*, *inf.* *βηναι*, *part.* *βας*, existing generally in the compounds, as in *αναβας*, having ascended; *καταβας*, having descended; *βη*, *εβα*, for *εβη*, he went to, Il. ε. 152; *βημεν* for *εβη ιεναι*, he went to go, hastened to go, ε. 167; *βη δ' ελααν*, he hastened to drive, he hastily drove, Il. ν. 27; *δους μη κηρες θανατοιω εβαν φερονται*, Il. β. 302, for *θανατου εβησαν*, whom the fates of death went taking away, whom the ministers of death, i. e. fate, took away.

"A few observations on the above article will close our critique on this Lexicon. Here we see that the author refers his readers to the original authorities for the meanings of the explained word, a laborious task, as he himself justly remarks, but fully compensated by its utility. From the example of *βαινω*, *imp.* *εβαινον*—*βαιω*, *f.* *ησω*—*βημι*, *aor.* 2, *εβην*, it appears that Dr. Jones refers the several branches of the verb, each to its respective and appropriate stem. Damm has set him an example for

this measure, though Sturze and Schleusner are chargeable with the neglect of it. The practice affords unspeakable advantages to the learner, as it enables him, by the most obvious and simple analogy, to retain words in his mind which would otherwise be forgotten unless held by the sole grasp of a powerful memory. The above explanation of *βαινω*, and its several branches, is in our opinion deserving of attention, as being perhaps the fairest specimen of lexicography that can well be met with. The learner is put in complete possession of its several senses by the aid of the context. The several branches of the verb are stated with the anomalies caused by the dialects and poetic licence. Dr. Jones has, indeed, largely profited by the labours of Damm, but he has condensed his matter into one tenth of the space which is occupied by that most admirable and useful lexicographer. Nor has he servilely copied his model, but tacitly shews him to have been mistaken in three or four points in this very article. Damm makes *βεβαισι* to be the Ionic form of *βεβηκασι*; whereas Dr. Jones represents it as a contraction of the perfect middle *βεβαιασι*. Damm again states *βεβαιμεν* to be a poetic form of *βεβαιναι*, while Dr. Jones takes it to be the perfect middle infinitive, *βεβαιεναι*, by Syncope *βεβαιναι*, *βεβαιμεν*. The former writer seemingly, could not comprehend how *βειμαι*, if the Ionic form of *βησμαι*, could mean, 'I will love or obey,' as it does in Il. o. 194. He therefore classes it with *βιω* as its root. But Dr. Jones has happily hit on the intermediate idea, for what is to love or obey a person, but to go by his will? And here it is obvious to remark, how similar the idioms of the Greek and of the English are to each other on many occasions. This is one among many reasons, why a Greek Lexicon should be written in our native tongue. Damm renders *βηδ' ειναι*, Il. β. 183, by *cæpit currere*: but this version does not seem so well to express the sense of the original, as 'he hastened to go,' or 'he hastily went;' nor does *βηδ' ελααν*, bear the precise sense of *agbat equos*, but is more adequately represented by 'he hastened to drive,' or 'he hastily drove.' And here it

is worthy of notice, that where Dr. Jones quotes a phrase differing in genius from one in our own tongue, he renders it literally first, and then expresses it in a free version, conformably to our own. This is not the usual practice of lexicographers, but it is as it should be, since it enables the learner to perceive in his own tongue the peculiar features of the Greek. Upon the whole, this Lexicon is a work of great labour and research. We have much pleasure in adding, that we deem it also a work of very great merit, which we conceive cannot fail to meet the approbation and patronage of those, who, where the English language is used, study to acquire a knowledge of the Greek."

J. JONES.

Unitarianism in the United States of America.

SOME very interesting letters have been lately received by Mr. Belsham from America, and put into our hands by the venerable friend to whom they were addressed. We lay before our readers a few extracts. The names of the writers are well known in this country, but we do not think it necessary to give them. The fact of Mr. Jefferson, the Ex-President, having avowed his belief in Unitarian Christianity, is of great importance, and will be hailed with delight by all that desire to see divine revelation adorned by the intellectual endowments and public virtue of its individual professors.

The following is from a letter dated Baltimore, June 20, 1823.

"In this country the interests of religious truth are as prosperous as could be expected. Important changes of opinions and habits must always be slow. Prejudices are stubborn things, and can be removed only by degrees; but in the United States I have reason to think, that they are yielding as rapidly as the nature of things will admit. The advocates of old systems are awake; the lovers of the dark things of the dark ages are numerous and vigilant; opposition to the progress of religious knowledge is perpetual and strong; the flood-gates of obloquy are hoisted; and the thunders of anathema and denunciation roar from one end of the Union to the other; yet there is a spirit

abroad, which winds its resistless way in defiance of the arm of flesh, the bigotry of ignorance, and the terrors of a gloomy, perverted theology. Truth has friends, and the number is increasing; it will increase; ten years have produced a great change, and ten more will witness a greater.

"You have once or twice inquired of me respecting Mr. Jefferson. I have lately seen a long and excellent letter from him, in which he gives his views of Christianity. This letter amounts to an unequivocal declaration of his belief in the Christian religion. In high party times, he was charged with being sceptical, and perhaps he was so, for he had studied Christianity only in the garb in which mistaken orthodoxy had laboured to clothe it. He has since examined the ground on rational principles, and the result has been conviction. In a letter to me, written more than two years ago, he touches on the subject in a manner, which gives some hints of his opinions, and you will doubtless be gratified with the following extract. 'I hold the precepts of Jesus,' says Mr. Jefferson, 'as delivered by himself, to be the most pure, benevolent and sublime, which have ever been preached to man. I adhere to the principles of the first age, and consider all subsequent innovations as corruptions of his religion, having no foundation in what came from him. The metaphysical insanities of Athanasius, of Loyola, and of Calvin, are to my understanding mere relapses into Polytheism, differing from Paganism only by being more unintelligible. The religion of Jesus is founded on the unity of God, and this principle chiefly gave it a triumph over the rabble of heathen gods then acknowledged. Thinking men of all nations rallied readily to the doctrine of one only God, and embraced it with the pure morals which Jesus inculcated. If the freedom of religion, guaranteed to us by law *in theory*, can ever rise *in practice* under the overbearing inquisition of public opinion, truth will prevail over fanaticism, and the genuine doctrines of Jesus, so long perverted by his pseudo priests, will again be restored to their original purity. This reformation will advance with the other improvements of the human mind, but

too late for me to witness it.' From this extract you can judge with some degree of accuracy concerning Mr. Jefferson's opinions. The letter mentioned above is much more full, and contains a comprehensive outline of the purposes of the Christian dispensation."

The same writer adds,

"What a wonderful man is that Rammohun Roy of Calcutta! Few have so much learning and talent. His books must produce an effect. They are written with power and judgment. I had a letter from him lately, in which he says he thinks of visiting this country, and consequently England shortly. The venerable Mr. Eastin, of Kentucky, has just written to me, that eight societies are forming in Missouri on Unitarian principles. In the south of Kentucky there are more than forty Unitarian preachers among the Separate Baptists. The Christians, a growing sect, call themselves Unitarians, but they are commonly ignorant and fanatical. Time and knowledge will correct them."

Another correspondent writes from Boston, May 3, 1823, as follows:

"I hope, my dear Sir, you will live many years, if so it seem good to the Supreme Arbiter, to witness the spread of those views of Christianity which you justly consider so consonant to the doctrines of the New Testament, and so favourable to the happiness of mankind. In this country, not only do they rapidly extend, but they seem also to approve themselves to men of intelligence and worth. Our ex-president Adams, now eighty-six, and in the full possession of his understanding, you know has been for many years a decided and zealous Unitarian. I saw lately a correspondence between our estimable fellow-citizen Colonel Pickering (now eighty) and Mr. Jefferson upon this subject, and I assure you read it with no small surprise. Pickering, of the genuine race of the New Evangelical Puritans, and of a family for several generations of the strictest of that sect; the most inflexible man since the days of Cato, the zealous supporter of Washington's administration, and after a distinguished career during the revolutionary war, appointed by W. Postmaster General, and then Secretary of State—bred up by temperament,

education and fierce political rivalry to abhor Jefferson, who no doubt returned it by perhaps a more guarded but a deeper animosity:—He writes to the man who seemed almost his natural enemy, in a style truly gentlemanly and truly Christian, to inquire into his sentiments respecting the Christian revelation. He states that many persons believe Mr. J. to be a sceptic or a disbeliever, hoping it is not so, but that his rejection is only that of the irrational, unscriptural, and absurd doctrines which have too often passed for Christianity; hoping too, that Mr. J. will not permit his celebrated name to descend to posterity, as that of a man who disbelieved the doctrines of the Christian revelation, and to be used as an argument against its credibility. Jefferson replies with great good sense and good feeling, and as it appeared to me (scanning his words, you may assure yourself, with suspicious keenness) in a manner open and explicit. He professes his belief in the divine mission of Christ, his regret that the corruptions of Christianity have so long obscured its glories and prevented its reception—and his joy, that these corruptions are now passing away, and that the doctrine of the Divine Unity and just views of the divine character are making a progress so rapid and extensive. When I speak of Mr. Pickering, I speak of a man of great intelligence and of a character which more resembles that of Cato than of any other man. His opinions were changed many years ago, by the reading of Dr. Price's Sermons, and he has since been a zealous Unitarian.

"These also are the opinions of General Brooks, Dr. Osgood's parishioner, whose steady liberality of sentiment had an effect the most beneficial upon the good Doctor's character and ministrations. He also has had a distinguished military career, and commanded a regiment at the capture of Burgoyne with great *éclat*. At the peace, he resumed the medical profession, and continued it with great reputation for thirty years, and indeed to the present time to his immediate friends and neighbours. He has been for seven or eight years governor of this state with great esteem, and with so much moderation,

that even the democrats had almost given up their opposition to his annual re-election. This office he resigned two months ago, to the regret of all. We have just lost an admirable man, Mr. George Cabot, of this town, a direct descendant I believe of Sebastian Cabot. He told me that more than forty years ago, he met with one or two merchants in a little counting-room, which he pointed out, to devise the means of publishing some liberal tracts, especially Dr. Priestley's little 'Appeal' and History of Corruptions. When the Doctor was at Philadelphia, Mr. C. was a senator in Congress, and his constant hearer and great admirer. Dr. Kirkland preached his funeral sermon last Sunday, and I hope to bring you acquainted with the character of this pure, able, judicious, and most amiable man. He was a Unitarian, who laid great stress upon the value of these principles; and at one of the last conversations I had with him, he expressed, in terms similar to those in which you are wont to clothe the strength of your belief, that those principles of which we were speaking, would in no long time become those of the intelligent and virtuous throughout the United States.

"I mention these men, my dear Sir, not because they are governors and senators, &c. These are names, and emphatically in this country, *vox et præterea nihil*, conferred upon the ignorant, the worthless and the vulgar. But I mention them as men of sense and reflection, raised, all of them, by these qualities, united with an excellent moral character, from an humble station, to much distinction among their fellow-citizens. They were all educated in the times and principles of Orthodoxy; all eminent during their whole lives in active life and the business of the world. That such men should become the supporters and advocates of liberal sentiments, in opposition to early prejudices, and moreover at a period of life when zeal is apt to cool, should take a warm interest in the propagation of Unitarian sentiments, I must think affords no mean presumption, that these opinions approve themselves, when examined, to the grave and intelligent inquirer."

From Washington, another corre-

spondent writes, of the date of March 20, 1823:

"I wrote you in November last from Philadelphia, acknowledging the receipt of your most valuable present of your excellent work on the Epistles, which the more I consult, the more highly I esteem, and think it beyond question the greatest of those great services you have rendered to the cause of Christian truth. Its effects will be widely and permanently felt in a future generation of men. I hope it will soon be reprinted in this country, and read not only on the shores of the Atlantic, but beyond the Alleghany chain on the banks of the Mississippi and Missouri. I have introduced it to the knowledge of several members of Congress, who appear to feel much interested in it. The suggestion in your esteemed favour of October 1st, respecting 'a public provision for the support of religion in every parish,' &c., is a thing concerning which I have no religious scruple. In the Eastern States it is adopted and maintained by some of the governments. But in the middle, southern and western States of this Union, nothing of the kind has been admitted. In this matter Congress have no power; the constitution prohibits them making any law respecting religion. In England the Imperium in Imperio which is peculiar to this country is little understood. Each of the twenty-four States is a perfect, absolute and independent sovereignty, in all things pertaining to its own territory and inhabitants. And the general government is a government of specific and limited powers, sovereign and supreme, with regard to the *united* force and independence of the whole, and also in all the external relations of the country with other powers, and in the collection and use of revenue for the Union; but entirely incapable of interfering with the internal legislation of each particular State. Owing to their not understanding this complicated system, we often smile to see in the English papers things said of the transactions of the American government, which are completely at variance with facts, and with its constitutional principles. I have visited New England, and am still disposed to think that their plan

of securing emoluments to the clergy, rather tends to retard the progress of truth than otherwise; it also occasions sometimes disagreeable feuds in parishes when a new sect arises. But I am not very confident in my opinion. As for the camp meetings I believe they are declining every where, and chiefly prevail in the western country. Fanaticism, however, in various shapes, is a very prevailing evil. Unitarianism will cure it, and I believe a large number of people, chiefly among the Baptists in Ohio, Kentucky, and West Virginia, have cast off their belief in the Trinity. They have still much to learn. One of their preachers, a plain man without education, but good plain sense and a strong understanding, was lately on a visit among us and our Baltimore friends, to get information on some points. This man had travelled above 600 miles on horseback, and perhaps may return with some new ideas."

London,

September 2, 1823.

SIR,
I OBSERVE that a report which crept into the newspapers relating to an attempt at the late Conference of the Wesleian ministers to impose the Liturgy of the Church of England upon the societies in that connexion, has been contradicted. Perhaps some of your readers can inform the public to what this contradiction amounts; whether it applies to the fact *in toto*, or merely to the wording of the resolution proposed. I am informed that the question of a Liturgy was actually moved and supported by the leading ministers in the connexion, and negatived by a majority of seventy and upwards; and also that the movers intended that the Liturgy should bring in with it, according to John Wesley's original plan, episcopal ordination, the readers being designed to be taken from amongst persons in holy orders. My information leads me to conclude that this attempt to approach towards the Church of England, though defeated, will be renewed. Should this conclusion be correct, it is easy to foresee that the Wesleians will divide into the two branches of Churchmen and Dissenters.

EPISCOPUS.

REVIEW.

"Still pleased to praise, yet not afraid to blame."—Pore.

ART. I.—*Sermons, selected from the Papers of the late Rev. Henry Turner, &c.*

(Concluded from p. 473.)

THE tenth sermon in this volume, is "on True and False Shame, and the Necessity of Universal Obedience." [Psalm cxix. 6.] Mr. H. T. correctly remarks, that, in the judgment of the author of the text, "the most probable method of repressing the predominance of shame, is faithfully to observe all the Divine commands." (140.)

Agreeably to the judicious arrangement made by the editor, a discourse succeeds, (XI., from Rom. i. 16,) which is entitled, "Reasons for not being ashamed of the Gospel." We had the happiness of knowing, that this was, at least, one of the earliest of the sermons composed by the departed preacher: and it reflects great credit, in every view, upon his memory. He points out various ways in which a "most unworthy shame" respecting Christianity finds a place among us, and then takes into consideration the motives assigned by Paul, for his open and courageous profession of the doctrine of a crucified Saviour. We transcribe a few sentences:

"How many men have there been, possessed of so little fortitude, that, when exposed to the taunt of the unbeliever, they have been eager to make their timely escape, by a quick adoption of the opinions of him, whom they so unworthily dread! Or, if not moved to this act of desperation, how anxiously do they decline the contest, as one in which they have no concern; and refer it to professional men, whose business it is to defend their religion! Professional men! What, do we live in a Protestant country, and have we yet to learn, that Christianity is every one's profession; that no man can be a Christian by proxy; and that none will be asked, in the great day of account, what his priest, or his minister, believed, but what he himself believed! and still more, how his behaviour corresponded with his belief?"—P. 162.

VOL. XVIII.

3 z

"Attention to our Work in its proper Season," [John ix. 4,] is inculcated in the twelfth discourse. We have been impressed by the following observation, (177,)

"If our Saviour, with his extraordinary powers and incomparable means of usefulness, considered himself as under obligation to observe the strictest industry, and the most unwearied diligence, how little would it become any of us to imagine that *our* duties are not calculated to occupy a constant and habitual attention!"

The case of "the Syrophenician Woman," [Mark vii. 27,] furnishes the interesting topic of No. XIII. Our Lord's apparent unwillingness to relieve her, is clearly explained, and the virtuous features of her character are with equal distinctness pointed out. In this discourse the author has evidently kept his eye upon one of the late Bishop Horsley's,* of which, however, no servile or indiscriminate, but a truly judicious, use is made.

Among the most valuable sermons in the volume, we rank No. XIV., which bears the title of "All live unto God." [Luke xx. 38.] It treats, as might be expected, of the Christian doctrine of a resurrection from the grave. The text is correctly paraphrased: "*All*, whether now breathing this vital air, or long since returned to that dust, from which they were taken, *live unto him*, who has decreed their future resurrection, and regards it as if it were present; 'who quickeneth the dead and calleth those things which are not, as though they were.'" (203.)

We lay before our readers another passage:

"Do men attempt to intimidate or allure you into disobedience? You have a life 'hidden with Christ in God,' with which they cannot interfere; a life far more enduring than the fleeting shadows which compose this earthly life. You

* Vol. III. Nos. 37 and 38. Mon. Repos. VIII. 334.

'live unto God.' What a pleasing, awful prospect is before us! That great end of all things, for which this world of men was constituted, for which they have lived, and in the expectation of which they have died, is still to come. The pious dead still wait for their redemption; they wait because *we* are not yet prepared for that awful trial which is to ensue; because the long-suffering of God still allows time for *our* repentance; and his wise providence is still multiplying and extending the means of grace, in behalf of a sinful and disobedient world. They have not yet received the promise: it is delayed, because the world is not yet ripe for the consummation of all things; they have received it not, that (as the apostle says) 'they without us should not be made perfect;' and I cannot but conceive of our pious fathers as waiting in peaceful and patient expectation, till children, and children's children, be perfected."—Pp. 208, 209.

Of the fifteenth discourse the title is "on Love to Christ" [1 Pet. i. 8]; the nature and foundation of which habit of mind are excellently stated. This sermon was "preached before the celebration of the Lord's Supper:" and a powerful admonition to the observance of a rite so interesting and significant forms the conclusion. According to the preacher, we should love Jesus Christ, because he is the beloved Son of God, and the most perfect example of every human virtue, because the most tender compassion for mankind was a governing motive of his services and self-denial, because of the sufferings which he voluntarily underwent for our sakes, because he still lives, and ever intercedes for us, and, lastly, because, though now we see him not, yet, if we are faithful unto the end, we *shall* see him, and be received into the felicity of an everlasting fellowship with him.

The sixteenth discourse, is "on Uncharitable Judgment of others' Faults." [Jonah iv. 9.] A more pertinent text might, perhaps, have been selected. The sermon, however, consists principally of very good observations on Jonah's character, and on part of his history, *one* of the remarks suggested by which is, (239,)

"How carefully should we guard against an unfeeling temper in forming our judgments of mankind, and con-

signing them over to receive the full severity of the divine sentence!"

From Matt. xx. 22, Mr. H. T. professes to discourse, in No. XVII., "on the proper Objects of a Christian's pursuits." Yet a considerable portion of the sermon is occupied in an illustration of that incident in the evangelic narrative, which furnishes the text. The reader will meet here with a clear and faithful illustration of the expression, "*worshipping him.*"

"Means of securing the Love of Christ," [John xv. 9, 10,] are stated in the eighteenth sermon: these are mainly, obedience to his commands and the imitation of his example. This preacher well observes, "that it is the excellent effect of the Christian scheme to make religion familiar to our thoughts, and to bring home to our business and bosoms the justest and sublimest motives of conduct." (267.)

The nineteenth discourse treats of a very attractive and interesting subject, and bears the title, "Religion suited to this World, as well as to the next" [John xvii. 15]: it is employed in an illustration of two propositions; "*first*, that the world is the appointed field for the exercise of Christian duty; *secondly*, that the Christian ought to unite his earnest endeavours with his prayers to God, that he may so live in the world, as to be kept from the evil of it." Towards the conclusion, Mr. H. T. makes a very appropriate extract from Milton's *Areopagitica*.

In No. XX. [Matt. xxiii. 7] the reader is presented with a sermon of great value, on "The Woe denounced against Causes of Offence." The fact and its consequences are first represented: then it is viewed as arising out of the established order of Providence; and, finally, the writer shews, that "this must not be used as an argument for any kind of wickedness, or even of negligence, in regard to the best interests of mankind." Another charming passage is introduced from that treatise of our sublime poet, which has just been mentioned: parents and children, governors and subjects, masters and servants, the aged and the young, in short, men of all classes, and those, in particular, who are nearly and mutually related, may

derive instruction from the reasoning and admonitions of the admirable discourse to which it is transferred.

By the next, XXI., we are scarcely less impressed and gratified: it is "on the Duty and Efficacy of Prayer." [Matt. vii. 7.] A most important obligation, an essential as well as a salutary practice, is here urged with great strength of reasoning. To the following observations we cordially subscribe, and are reminded by them of Ogden* and of Price† (310, 311):

"I know it has been said, that the important practical tendency of the exercise of prayer will, of itself, operate as a sufficient motive for engaging in it. Our prayers, it is said, for support under affliction, or of [for] virtue‡ in temptation, though they do not induce God to bestow more of his supporting grace, than by his inherent goodness he is ever disposed to bestow, have a most beneficial effect upon our own temper, and serve to impress upon us a sense of our constant dependence upon the Almighty, for every thing which makes our lives happy. In like manner, our intercessions in behalf of our fellow-creatures, though they cannot have any direct influence in promoting their welfare, produce, indirectly, the most important results, by engaging us, in a solemn and impressive manner, to the performance of charitable and benevolent duties. But I think I may safely appeal to the good sense and experience of every religious person, whether these are the reasons which have ever led, or ever would lead, to that spontaneous and sincere devotion, from which alone these good effects would flow? Nay, whether they would even consider it as justifiable to use the forms of devotion, under such impressions? Could the form of petition be used with propriety by those, who do not believe that the Divine Being regards the prayers of men? Might it not appear even impious, to address the Almighty in language which we considered as expressing false and unfounded notions? For surely no apparent advantages can justify us, in acting upon fictitious principles. And in religion especially, where every thing should breathe simplicity and godly sincerity, it cannot be warrantable to act conformably with ideas which we believe to be erroneous; to connect the venerable name of God

with a supposed falsehood, merely because we imagine good effects will be produced on our own minds, by such a practice. But it is altogether a fallacy; no such prayer was ever presented; and the valuable tendency of the exercise must entirely cease, as soon as the worshiper believes, that nature and religion hold out to him no hope of obtaining a favourable answer to his sincerest prayer, under his greatest afflictions."

The arguments which the Scriptures contain in behalf of prayer, are then excellently set forth.

"A sermon on New Year's Day," (No. XXII.) closes this part of the volume: the subject [Eccles. xi. 7] is, *the tenure on which we possess even the innocent and allowable pleasures of life*; and the discourse receives a melancholy interest from the circumstance of its being "the last composed by the author."

Three Addresses at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, one at a funeral, and an office for public worship, are annexed; with a view to the gratification and benefit of different classes of readers.

The sermons that we have now reviewed are short; without, however, being meagre and superficial. They are, at the same time, methodical: and the method is, for the most part, announced. This we consider as a capital excellence. *Hume*, whose literary taste and judgment are almost universally admitted, censures "our modern orators," for their rejection of that order, "which seems so requisite to argument, and without which it is scarcely possible to produce an entire conviction on the mind."*

Mr. Henry Turner appears to have possessed the qualifications of a sound theologian—industry, candour, a sincere and pious mind, discernment, and a correct acquaintance with scriptural phraseology. He was evidently characterized by an enlightened zeal for the tenets which he embraced on inquiry and conviction: hence they are neither unseasonably introduced nor disingenuously kept back or coloured. His style is in general pure, glowing and agreeable; such as marks the scholar and the man of taste. The grand charm of these discourses

* Sermons on Prayer and Intercession.

† Dissertations, No. II. Sect. 1.

‡ Perhaps, *the prayers of virtue*.

* Essays, &c. (1793,) Vol. I. p. 111.

will be found, however, in the fine spirit which they breathe, in the devotion and benevolence, by which they are manifestly dictated. This author values the simple Christianity of the New Testament, for its moral genius and excellence; and his compositions prove, as did his life, that he saw nothing in the gospel, which should forbid it to enter into all our feelings, all our circumstances, all our objects of pursuit and care. We perceive him to be in earnest, ardent, yet gentle, the determined foe of vice, but the friendly monitor of the vicious. To the religious body, of which he was an ornament, his posthumous sermons must be eminently acceptable: and we are encouraged, by the demand for them,† to hope, that they will be most extensively useful. By those of the young, at whose immediate desire they have been published, may they be read in the temper with which they were written and delivered! "There is not a stronger bond of union between the youthful heart, and those to whom the formation of the mind is," in any shape or degree, "intrusted, than that which is established by the communication and reception of knowledge." In the present instance, may the *knowledge* which has been so impressively recorded, make numbers of the rising race "wise unto salvation!"

Unitarian Controversy at Calcutta.

ART. II. III. IV.—Concluded from p. 479.

ON the subject of the principles and mental habits of the Hindoos, Rammohun Roy is the best of all witnesses. He says that 3-5ths of the inhabitants of Hindoostan consist of this people; the remaining 2-5ths being chiefly Moosulmans. The latter are, as all the world knows, firmly devoted to the belief of one God; "the former, (says our author,) are, with a few exceptions, immersed in gross idolatry, and in belief of the most extravagant description respecting futurity, antiquity, and the miracles of their deities and saints, as handed down to them and recorded in

their ancient books." Precepts of Jesus, &c., London Edition, p. 122.

"The mysterious doctrine of three Gods in one Godhead," is stated by this Christian Hindoo to be "the origin of Mohummudanism, and the stumbling-block to the conversion of the more enlightened amongst the Hindoos."—Ibid. p. 121.

In reference to this topic, he pronounces a high eulogium upon Christianity:

"If Christianity inculcated a doctrine which represents God as consisting of three persons, and appearing sometimes in the human form, at other times in a bodily shape like a dove, no Hindoo, in my humble opinion, who searches after truth, can conscientiously profess it in preference to Hindooism; for that which renders the modern Hindoo system of religion absurd and detestable, is, that it represents the divine nature, though one, as consisting of many persons, capable of assuming different forms for the discharge of different offices. I am, however, most firmly convinced, that Christianity is entirely free from every trace of Polytheism, whether gross or refined."—Ibid. pp. 317, 318.

Rammohun Roy's books are rendered the more interesting by his blending with his arguments and criticisms occasional appeals to his own experience. For instance, he says,

"For my conviction, and for the satisfaction of those who consider the Precepts of Jesus as a guide to peace and happiness, his word, 'They may be one as we are,' *John*, ch. xvii. ver. 11, in defining the nature of the unity between God and Jesus, fully suffices. Disgusted with the puerile and unsociable system of Hindoo idolatry, and dissatisfied at the cruelty allowed by Moosulmanism against Nonmoosulmans, I, on my searching after the truth of Christianity, felt for a length of time very much perplexed with the difference of sentiments found among the followers of Christ, (I mean Trinitarians and Unitarians, the grand divisions of them,) until I met with the explanation of the unity given by the divine Teacher himself as a guide to peace and happiness."—Ibid. p. 167.

In answer to a question of the Missionary's "Did Mohummud, arrogant as he was, ever make such a declaration as Jesus did, namely that I am with you always, even to the end of the world?" our author says,

"I only entreat the attention of the

* A second edition will soon appear.

Editor to the following assertions of Mohummud, known to almost all Moosulmans who have the least knowledge of their own religion: 'Truly the great and glorious God raised me as *mercy* and *guidance* to worlds.' 'I was the first of all Prophets in creation, and the last in appearance.' 'I was a Prophet when Adam was in earth and water.' 'I am the Lord of those that were sent by God. This is no boast to me.' 'My shadow is on the head only of my followers.' 'He who has seen me has seen God.' 'He who has obeyed me, has obeyed God: and he who has sinned against me, has sinned against God.'

"It is, however, fortunate for Moosulmans, that from want of familiarity and intimate connexion between the primitive Mohummuddans and their contemporary Heathens, the doctrines of Monotheism taught by Mohummud, and entertained by his followers, have not been corrupted by polytheistical notions of Pagans, nor have heathen modes of worship or festivals been introduced among Moosulmans of Arabia and Turkey as a part of their religion. Besides, metaphorical expressions having been very common among Oriental nations, Mohummuddans could not fail to understand them in their proper sense, although these expressions may throw great difficulty in the way of an European Commentator even of profound learning."—Ibid. pp. 199, 200.

The following observations on the success of Trinitarianism are sensible, and appear to us perfectly just:

"With respect to the final success of the Trinitarian party, it appears to me the event naturally to have been expected. For, to the people of those ages, doctrines that resembled the polytheistical belief that till then prevailed, must have been more acceptable than those which were diametrically opposed to such notions. The idea of a God in human form was easy and familiar: Emperors and Empresses had altars raised to them even during their lives, and after death were enrolled as divinities. Perhaps too, something may justly be attributed to a certain degree of pride and satisfaction in the idea, that the religion they had begun to profess was dictated immediately by the Deity himself, rather than by any subordinate agency. There had not been among the Heathens any class of mankind to whom they were accustomed to look up with that devotion familiarly entertained by the Jews towards Moses and their Prophets, and they were consequently ready to elevate

to a God any being who rose in their estimation above the level of mankind."—Ibid. p. 218.

Rammohun Roy finds a reason for the prevailing belief of the Deity of Christ in the application of the term "God," though figuratively, to Christ; but, he says, and the remark is worthy of the serious consideration of Trinitarians, whose whole system falls to the ground if each of the three persons in the Trinity cannot be proved to be truly and by himself perfect God, "with respect to the Holy Ghost, I must confess my inability to find a single passage in the whole Scriptures, in which the Spirit is addressed as God, or as a person of God, so as to afford to believers of the Trinity an excuse for their profession of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost."—Ibid. p. 239.

Of the Atonement, Rammohun Roy writes with peculiar clearness and force. He contends that the sacrifice of Christ was not literal but spiritual, and uses the following argument, *ad hominem*:

"Moreover in explaining such phrases as 'I am the living bread,'—'If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever,'—'The bread that I will give is my flesh,' 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man,' and 'Unless ye eat his flesh and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,'—'My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed,'—Protestant commentators take upon themselves to interpret that these phrases are in allusion to the manner of sacrifice, and that the eating of the flesh of Jesus and drinking his blood must be understood in a spiritual, not in a carnal sense. If these writers make so direct an encroachment upon the literal sense of those phrases in order to avoid the idea of cannibalism being a tenet of Christianity, why should I not be justified upon the same principles and on the authority of the apostle in understanding by sacrifice in the language of the apostle a virtual oblation; that Christianity may not be represented as a religion founded upon the horrible system of human victims?"—Final Appeal, (Calcutta Edition,) pp. 44, 45.

The obvious absurdity of pressing the case of the "scape-goat" into an argument for the common doctrine of atonement, is well exposed by the Hindoo Reformer:

"The Editor relates, (page 524,) that the priest used to lay his hands on

the head of a living goat, 'and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, putting them on the head of the goat, and by the hand of a fit person to send it away into the wilderness as an atonement for all their sins in every year.' He then infers from this circumstance that, 'commandments like these did more than merely foretell the atonement of Christ.' Were we to consider at all the annual scape-goat as an indication of some other atonement for sin, we must esteem it as a sign of Aaron's bearing the iniquities of Israel; both the scape-goat and Aaron having alike borne the sins of others without sacrificing their lives; but by no means can it be supposed a sign of the atonement of Christ, who, according to the author, bore the sins of men by the sacrifice of his own life, and had therefore no resemblance to the scape-goat or Aaron. Exodus xxviii. 38: 'And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead that Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things which the children of Israel shall hallow in all their holy gifts; and it shall be always upon his forehead that they may be accepted before the Lord.' I wonder that the Rev. Editor himself notices here that the iniquities of Israel were forgiven by confession over the scape-goat, without animal or human victims, and yet represents the circumstance of the *scape-goat* as a prediction of the sacrificial death of Christ, and insists upon the forgiveness of sins being founded upon the effusion of blood."—Ibid. pp. 50, 51.

The Indian convert shews continually that he has weighed orthodox epithets and exclamations, and that he will not accept them for arguments. The following is a case in point:

"The Rev. Editor expresses his indignation at the mode of reasoning adopted by me in the passages above quoted; saying, 'Should not a creature, a worm of the dust who cannot fully comprehend the mysteries of his own being, pause before he arraign his Maker of gross injustice, and charge him with having founded all religion on an act of palpable iniquity?' (P. 529.)

"There appears here a most strange mistake on the part of the Editor. It is he who seems to me to be labouring to prove the absurdity that God, the Almighty and all-merciful, is capable of a palpable iniquity—determined to have punishment, though he leave quite unpunished; inflicting the marks of his wrath on the innocent for the purpose of sparing those who justly deserve the weight of its terrors. If he mean to object to the rashness of applying the

limited capacity of the human understanding to judge the unsearchable things of the wisdom of God, and therefore denies my right, as a worm of the dust, to deduce any thing from human ideas inimical to his view of the Divine will, I can only say that I have for my example, that of a fellow-worm in his own argument to shew the necessity that the Almighty laboured under to have his justice satisfied."—Ibid. pp. 60, 61.

The accomplished Hindoo has been too long accustomed to look through sophistry in the writings of Heathens, to be imposed upon by it in those of Christians. By a single remark he levels the whole fabric of Missionary theology:

"To this assertion of the Editor, 'the blood of no mere creature could take away sin,' I add the assertion also maintained by the Editor, that 'the Creator is not composed of blood and flesh,' and leave to him to say, if the blood of Jesus was not that of a creature, whose blood it was. It is evident from the circumstance of the blood of a creature being unable to take away sin and the Creator having no blood, that the taking away of sin can have no connexion with blood or a bloody sacrifice."—Ibid. p. 85.

Rammohun Roy can retort smartly without ill-nature, e. g.

"In answer to one of the many insinuations made by the Editor in the course of his arguments, to wit, 'If this be Christ, what must become of the precepts of Jesus?' (Page 576.) I most reluctantly put the following query in reply. If a slain lamb be God Almighty or his true emblem, what must be his worship, and what must become of his worshippers?"—Ibid. p. 209.

The Indian Unitarian well exposes the inconsistency of the system of "Satisfaction" in imputing contrary attributes to the Father and the Son, whom it yet supposes to be one and the same being:

"The Editor in common with other Trinitarians conceives that God the Son equally with God the Father (according to their mode of expression) is possessed of the attributes of perfection, such as mercy, justice, righteousness, truth, &c., yet he represents them so differently as to ascribe to the Father strict justice or rather vengeance, and to the Son unlimited mercy and forgiveness, that is, the Father, the first person of the Godhead, having been in wrath at the sinful

conduct of his offending creatures, found his mercy so resisted by justice that he could not forgive them at all, through mercy, unless he satisfied his justice by inflicting punishment upon these guilty men; but the Son, the second person of the Godhead, though displeased at the sins of *his offending creatures*, suffered his mercy to overcome justice, and by offering his own blood as an atonement for their sins, he has obtained for them pardon without punishment; and by means of vicarious sacrifice, reconciled them to the Father and satisfied his justice and vengeance. If the justice of the Father did not permit his pardoning sinful creatures, and reconciling them to himself in compliance with his mercy, unless a vicarious sacrifice was made to him for their sins; how was the justice of the Son prevailed upon by his mercy to admit their pardon, and their reconciliation to himself, without any sacrifice, offered to him as an atonement for their sins? It is then evident, that according to the system of Trinitarians, the Son had a greater portion of mercy than the Father to oppose to his justice, in having his sinful creatures pardoned, without suffering them to experience individual punishment. Are these the doctrines on which genuine Christianity is founded? God forbid!

"If the first person be acknowledged to be possessed of mercy equally with the second, and that he, through his infinite mercy towards his creatures, sent the second to offer his blood as an atonement for their sins, we must then confess that the mode of the operation and manifestation of mercy by the first is strange and directly opposite to that adopted by the second, who manifested his mercy even by the sacrifice of life, while the first person displayed his mercy only at the death of the second, without subjecting himself to any humiliation or pain."—*Ibid.* pp. 240—242.

The fanciful hypothesis of two natures in Christ is laid bare in the following remarks of Rammohun Roy:

"The Editor says that the expression of Jesus to Mary, John xx. 17, 'Go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God,' was merely in his human nature. I wish the Editor had furnished us with a list, enumerating those expressions that Jesus Christ made in his human capacity, and another shewing such declarations as he made in his divine nature, with authorities for the distinction. I might have in that case attentively examined them

as well as their authorities. From his general mode of reasoning I am induced to think, that he will sometimes be obliged, in explaining a single sentence in the Scriptures, to ascribe a part of it to Jesus as a man, and another part to him in his divine nature. As for example, John v. 22, 23, 'For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who sent me.' The first part of this sentence 'hath committed all judgment unto the Son,' must have been (according to the Editor) spoken in the human nature of Jesus Christ, since the Almighty in exercising his power does not stand in need of another's vesting him with that power. The second part of the same sentence, 'all men should honour the Son as they honour the Father,' must be ascribed by the Editor to Jesus as God, he having been worthy to be honoured as the Father is—and the last part 'who hath sent me,' relates again to Christ's human capacity, since it implies his subjection to the disposal of another. Is this the internal evidence of Christianity on which the orthodox divines lay stress? Surely not."—*Ibid.* pp. 289, 290.

We have room for only one further extract from these able defences of Christian Unitarianism: it relates to the identity of Christian and Heathen Polytheism:

"The Editor denies positively the charge of admitting three Gods, though he is in the practice of worshiping God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. I could wish to know what he would say when a Hindoo also would deny Polytheism on the same principle, that if three separate persons be admitted to make one God, and those that adore them be esteemed as worshipers of one God, what objection could be advanced justly to the oneness of three hundred and thirty-three million of persons in the Deity, and to their worship in different emblems? For, oneness of three or of thirty millions of separate persons is equally impossible, according to human experience, and equally supportable by mystery alone."—*Ibid.* pp. 301, 302.

In perusing these volumes we have experienced great pleasure at seeing this Hindoo scholar familiar with our best biblical critics. He frequently quotes by name, Cappe, Newcome, Macknight, Doddridge, Whitby and

others. Citing the "Improved Version," he says, (Final Appeal, p. 297,) "for which the Christian world is indebted to its eminently learned authors." And having occasion to refer to Locke, he characterizes him as "one of the greatest men that ever lived."—Ibid. p. 80.

Mr. Adam, the author of the Sermon which stands third on our list, is a native of North Britain, who was sent out to India by the Baptist Missionary Society. Having become an Unitarian through the instrumentality of Rammohun Roy, whom he had hoped to bring over to Trinitarianism, he has seceded from his former connexion, and become the minister of the first Unitarian congregation in Bengal. His abandonment of the system of his former patrons has exposed him to bitter reproach, but we are authorized to say that his old, no less than his new, religious associates hold his moral character and talents in high respect.

Some incidental expressions in Rammohun Roy's works lead us to conclude that he at first adopted, if he does not still hold, the Arian hypothesis: of this hypothesis the "Claims of Jesus" is an avowed defence. The argument of the sermon is summed up in the following observations on the nature of Christ, as the Son of God:

"Thus we find that whether the title is applied to Adam or to Jesus—to the former in reference to his creation, or to the latter in reference to his conception in the womb of Mary, and his resurrection from the dead, there is one idea common to all those uses, and on account of which it seems in every instance to have been applied—the idea of the communication of existence by the power of God immediately exerted, without the intervention, as far as we are told or are able to perceive, of any inferior agent. It is necessary to take only one step further—to apply this principle of interpretation in another single instance, and we shall then possess a consistent view of all its uses, together with a scriptural and definite notion of the original nature of the person of Christ. He is directly and immediately derived from God his Father, without the intervention of any other agent, whereas all other beings have been mediately and indirectly derived from God, i. e. through the instrumentality of Jesus Christ, as has been

already established from Scripture, in a preceding part of this discourse. From this we must at once perceive the inconsistency of maintaining his supreme, undivided and independent Deity, as well as the propriety of those numerous scriptural expressions which describe him as the only-begotten Son of God, the first-born of every creature, the beginning of the creation of God; and the just ground of that superiority to every other order of beings which is uniformly claimed for him in the New Testament. He is as far below the unoriginate Jehovah as the derivation of his nature can place him—and he is as far above every other existence as the immediateness of that derivation can raise him. Such, then, is Jesus:—the first and only being created originally by the immediate power of God—the first and only being begotten in the womb of a virgin by the immediate power of God—and the first and only being raised from death to life by the immediate power of God."—Pp. 22, 23.

The reader of this passage will judge of the propriety of Mr. Ivimey's denunciation of Mr. Adam in a newspaper as a *Socinian*, and his vindication of the term as applied to this gentleman on the ground of his declaring "that Jesus Christ was a mere man, and that he had no existence before he was born of the virgin."*

We do not agree with Mr. Adam in his Arianism, but we revere his love of truth, admire his ingenuousness, respect his talents, and hope for much good to India from his enlightened zeal.

Since we began this article we have received the copy of a letter from Rammohun Roy to a friend at Liverpool, lately come to hand. The interesting writer expresses great satisfaction in the marks of regard which have been shewn him by the English Unitarians, whom he assures of his warmest esteem. He sends copies of the *Final Appeal* to several of the Unitarian ministers in this country. He acknowledges with gratitude the receipt of several of our publications, and especially of the "Improved Version;" the advantages that he has derived from these, he says, it is impossible for him fully to estimate; and he expresses the hope of being benefited by future favours of the

* See Mon. Repos. XVII. 685.

same kind. He informs his correspondent that the Unitarian brethren at Calcutta have not yet succeeded in getting an eligible piece of ground for the erection of a chapel, but look confidently forward to this object. And he concludes with saying, that he feels a strong wish to visit Europe and the other quarters of the globe in the ensuing year; with a view, amongst other satisfactions, to a personal acquaintance with the Unitarians of Europe.

ART. IV.—*Two Sermons: the First, on the Love of Truth, including a Summary of the Lectures delivered at Essex Street Chapel; the Second, on the Benefits arising from Theological Controversy: preached in Essex Street Chapel, November, 1822. Introductory to the Course of Lectures for the Season.* By the Rev. Thomas Belsham. 8vo. pp. 52. Hunter. 1823.

MR. BELSHAM gives in the first of these Sermons a "Summary of his Lectures," of the subjects of which the following is a list: Evidences of the Jewish and Christian Revelation. Inquiry into Inspiration. State of the text of New Testament. Doctrines of Divine Revelation: Person of Christ: Holy Spirit: Atonement: Original Sin: Election: Grace: Perseverance. Constitution of a Christian Church, under which head is discussed the question of the support of the Christian Religion by the Civil Power. Positive Institutions. Nature and Foundation of Virtue and Moral Obligation. Phenomena of the Human Mind. Natural Arguments in favour of a Future Life. On all these interesting topics the preacher states the arguments in his usual perspicuous manner, and delivers his last thoughts. The summary is a syllabus of theology, and will be useful to the inquirer, and particularly to the lecturer. In conclusion, some reflections are made upon the subject of truth, which are both instructive and encouraging. We extract one passage:

"The sincere lover of truth will never cease to inquire, as long as the powers of intellect and investigation remain: for the little which he knows, inspires a thirst after further information; and he is conscious, that, however successful the result of his inquiries may have been, all

the knowledge which he has hitherto attained is as nothing in comparison with the vast unknown. It is said of one of the early reformers,* that when he lay upon his death-bed, if any present were discoursing upon some of those important theological questions which then agitated the Christian world, he would raise himself up in his bed, and would call to them to speak out, for that he should die with more comfort if he could learn some new truth before his departure. And a late venerable and learned prelate, who was an inquirer after truth all his days, did not distinctly discern the complete evidence of the simple humanity of Jesus Christ till he had passed his seventieth year."—P. 20.

The second Sermon is an inquiry into the useful purposes answered by error and controversy, and into the duties which the present unsettled state of things imposes upon the sincere professors of the Christian doctrine. Under the former branch of the inquiry, Mr. Belsham shews that controversies have confirmed the evidence of Christianity, that they present a just criterion for the discovery of truth, that they give birth to many of the sublimest virtues, that they are some of the most powerful stimulants and guards to personal and social virtue, and that they will eventually terminate in the discovery of truth, and in the prevalence of general unanimity and universal peace. The duties of the Christian in these circumstances are pointed out, viz. Submission to the will and wisdom of God, acquiescence in the divided state of the church, steadiness at the post of duty, and triumph in the prospect of the ultimate reign of truth and goodness. With great discrimination the preacher indulges much fervour of spirit. The most marked feature of this discourse is confidence in divine truth. The glowing descriptions and animated appeals which abound in it, cannot fail of interesting the reader's best affections.

On the benefits resulting from Persecution Mr. Belsham says,

"The advocate for truth is sometimes required to endure persecution of various kinds, and in various shapes. And time

* "Chytræus of Rostock, who died A. D. 1600, aged 70.—See *Fuller's Lives and Deaths of Modern Divines*."

has been, though happily those times are passed, in which the confessor of the Christian doctrine has sealed his testimony with his blood. And these are circumstances in which the most exalted virtues of the heart have been brought into exercise. To suffer martyrdom voluntarily and cheerfully, in a good cause and upon good principles, is the highest perfection of the human character. We venerate the hero who sacrifices his life in the field of honour, and the patriot who offers himself as a victim upon the altar of liberty and his country's rights;—to die in such a cause is sweet and glorious. What then is it to suffer and die in the cause of truth, of virtue, and mankind! What a constellation of virtues is here displayed!—zeal and courage in the defence of truth; resignation to the will of God; love to the human race; patience and fortitude under suffering; meekness, forbearance, and forgiveness of enemies; contempt of death in an honourable cause; and a glorious triumph over pain and ignominy and martyrdom, in the assured hope of sharing in the victory and in the throne of that glorious Leader, with whom and for whom they are now content to suffer.”—P. 39.

We are particularly pleased with the following statement of the good ends to be answered by religious differences:

“This harmony of spirit among those who differ in belief and in forms of worship, is a state of things which, however desirable in itself, the infirmity of human nature will seldom admit, and which the knowledge of mankind will not allow us to expect. Not penetrating each other's motives, not comprehending each other's views and prejudices, we do not make sufficient allowance for each other's errors; and are ready to wonder that what appears so clear to ourselves should not appear with equal strength of evidence to others. And it is well if we do not impute their conduct to improper motives and an unworthy bias. Be it so. In this imperfect world we are ourselves imperfect, and we live among imperfect beings. But even this defect of charity is not without its use. Christians of different sects and parties do not in general think well of each other. Trinitarians and Unitarians, Calvinists and Arminians, Churchmen and Dissenters, are apt to regard each other with dislike, and to speak of each other with contempt. But this mutual jealousy among different sects constitutes one of the most powerful motives to moral vigilance and to the practice of personal and social virtue. Regard to the

credit of the sect will not only lead men to be more than ordinarily kind to their fellow-sectaries, but will stimulate them to vigilance over themselves and others, that they may not by irregular and disreputable conduct entail disgrace upon the party which they espouse. Different sects frequently vie with each other in zeal for laudable and useful undertakings, in order to shew that their peculiar principles are at least equal with those of their neighbours in prompting to good works. This sectarian emulation is not indeed the best and purest principle of action; but it is powerful and useful; it is a good substitute where better principles are wanting, and comes in aid of better motives where such motives exist. Human virtue in its best state is very imperfect; and it requires every stimulus to keep it in vigorous action, and to repel indolence and sloth. And experience proves that virtue and religion prosper least when there is a dead calm in the intellectual and moral world, where there is no discussion of argument, where there is no collision of interest, where there is no vigilant sectary to spy out, and to publish, and to exaggerate the errors and failings of the dominant party; and where the triumphant sect domineers over the minds and consciences of the people with proud and unresisted sway.”—Pp. 41—43.

ART. V.—*A Familiar Dialogue between a Calvinist, a Socinian, and an Infidel; intended as an Answer to Mr. Wright's Pamphlet, called "The Trinitarian and Unitarian," &c. designed chiefly to guard the Minds of Young Persons against the pernicious Influence of Socinian Principles.* By B. Kent. 12mo. pp. 32. Trowbridge, Clark.

ART. VI.—*Truth and Facts Stated, and Misrepresentation Detected; a Review of Mr. B. Kent's "Familiar Dialogue between a Calvinist, a Socinian, and an Infidel."* By R. Wright. 12mo. pp. 36. Liverpool, printed by F. B. Wright: sold by Eaton, and Fox and Co., London. 1823.

MR. WRIGHT is not allowed to remain inactive. He has been challenged to theological combat by Mr. B. Kent, a Dissenting Minister, at Trowbridge, and has readily taken up the glove. As far as argument and good temper can prevail, Mr. Wright is decidedly successful, but

these, we fear, are not the means by which Mr. Kent and his partizans will allow a controversy to be decided.

Mr. Kent is a polemic of that school which holds that every thing is fair that is done against an adversary. He scruples no language, however gross, and makes statements without any seeming care concerning their truth. What must be thought of a Christian minister who says, "it is my firm opinion, that if it" (the "Socinian scheme") "were generally to prevail in this town, in a few months' time half our tradesmen would become bankrupts; such loose principles naturally lead to loose conduct, and loose conduct will always undermine a man's character and credit in society" (p. 16); and who can allow himself further to say, "A Socinian meeting is a house of call, where the God of this World directs his votaries to step in and stay a while, till they can obtain license to mix with the horrid crew of scoffers and libertines, who live as Atheists in the world" (pp. 29, 30)! This outrageous man vows enmity (p. 30) against Unitarians; but we think that there are few persons above the condition of barbarians who would set any value upon the friendship of such a fire-brand.

There is still something ludicrous in Mr. Kent's wrath. Passion vents itself in metaphors, and this enraged gentleman thus describes the Improved Version: "It came into the world at first with a horrid black skin and with cloven feet, and with a viper's sting under its tongue; and after all their attempts to hide its deformity under the finest and most costly drapery that art and labour could furnish, all the world have agreed to pronounce it an ugly monster, and are afraid to go near it" (p. 17). The meaning of this insane rant is simply that there is one Version of the Scriptures, with Notes, compiled from the labours of the learned of all parties, into which Mr. B. Kent is afraid to look.

Mr. Wright tells his townsman very frankly that the "Infidel" in his "Dialogue" is of his own creation, and that he is answerable for all that he puts into his mouth. Let us ask Mr. Kent, then, where he got the story, which he makes his Infidel utter, of the Unitarian minister who said in the pulpit "that some of

Paul's Epistles ought not to have been in the New Testament"? (P. 10.) No wonder, that he prompts his "Infidel" to calumny, since he says, in propria persona, that a question relating to the body and spirit of man being put, a few months ago, "to a Socinian minister by another minister of the orthodox persuasion," the answer was, 'O, as to that, Sir, there is nothing immaterial in me; when I die (said the Rev. Divine) there will be an end of me.'" (P. 21, note.) The relator of the story puts three notes of admiration at the conclusion. Well he might. The tale is admirable; but we suspect it is of his own invention, and are sure that it is a gross falsehood. If it be not, let Mr. Kent produce his proofs, and we engage to publish them to the world.

We had marked some other passages of this choice "Dialogue" for animadversion, and particularly its pretended quotations from Socinus and others, which are taken at second-hand and in the most bungling manner both with respect to names* and things, but we are disgusted with the writer, and turn to his answerer, who does not "answer a fool according to his folly," but with the meekness of wisdom exposes the evils of bigotry and pleads the cause of evangelical truth and charity.

The following passage from "Truth and Facts," will shew the Dialogue writer to the reader in another character, that of a biblical critic:

"After all Mr. K.'s outcry against those who deviate from the common version of the Scriptures, and his censure of new translations, he too can deviate, he too would have a new translation of, at least, some texts. (See p. 19.) The text, *The Lord our God is one Lord*, he would have read, *The Lord our Gods is one Jehovah*; and speaks with approbation of a Calvinist minister's having so read it in public. Mr. K. then has no objection to altering the translation of the

* E. g. Mr. B. Kent quotes, without understanding, a passage from Socinus's "Second Epistle to Balcerimicius:" the author, not named, from whom this learned theologian borrows, evidently meant the second epistle to Balcerovicius. [Socini Op. I. 424.] It is dangerous to quote works never read, and especially if they be written in an unknown tongue.

Scriptures, though he censures the Unitarians for altering it. As he would alter the English Bible, to make it express the polytheistical notion of *Gods*; can it be wrong to say that he believes in a plurality of Gods? He would have Jehovah to include *Gods*. To his substituting *Gods* for *God*, I must object as totally unauthorized, an unwarrantable alteration of the sense as well as the language of the Bible, and as subversive of what the Scriptures most clearly teach, that there is but one God, and that God is one, and because it would be directly calculated to lead the people into polytheism and idolatry."—Pp. 20, 21.

One more extract from Mr. Wright's judicious pamphlet will explain the result of this controversy, which, miserably as it has been conducted on the part of his antagonist, will not be without its benefits:

"I called upon the Trinitarian to express his doctrine in the words of Scripture, as I had done the Unitarian doctrine. This Mr. K. has not attempted: he admits that it cannot be done, and even ridicules me for requiring such a thing; but is it unreasonable, that those who identify their notions with the Scriptures, make them essential to salvation, and condemn as the enemies of Christ and the gospel, those who reject their dogmas, should be required to express them in the words of Scripture? Mr.

K. admits, that the terms used to express the Trinitarian doctrine, are not to be found in the Bible, that they were never in the Bible, (see p. 26,) that the doctrine is to be made out by inference, (p. 20,) and in this way he attempts to support it. Trinitarians have a right to adopt what terms they please to express their thoughts; but what right have they to make their thoughts, expressed in their own language, and not in the words of Scripture, essential articles of Christian faith, and to censure and condemn those who will not receive them as such? They have a right to make such inferences from the language of Scripture as seem to them proper; but they have no right to treat as fools and knaves those who think their inferences unfounded, and cannot receive them as doctrines of the gospel; but who admit as essential articles of faith, and as Christian doctrines, what can be fully expressed in the words of Jesus Christ and his apostles. Enough has come out in the present controversy to establish one important point: viz. That the Unitarian doctrine is fully revealed in plain and positive terms in the Holy Scriptures, and can be fully expressed in the words of Scripture, without either addition or comment: and that the Trinitarian doctrine is not fully revealed in plain and positive terms in Scripture, and cannot be expressed in the words of Scripture, but is made out and supported by inference."—Pp. 24, 25.

POETRY.

A

PARAPHRASE OF MICHEL ANGELO'S POEM

On the Perfections of the Deity, as they appear in the beauty of his Offspring:

τὸ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμεν

La forza d'un bel volto al ciel mi sprona,
 Ch' altro in terra non è che mi diletta,
 E vivo ascendo tra gli spirti eletti;
 Grazia ch' ad uom mortal raro si dona.
 Si ben col suo fattor l'opra consuona,
 Ch' a lui mi levo per divin concetti,
 E quivi n'formo i pensier tutti e i detti,
 Ardendo, amando per gentil persona.
 Onde, se mai da due begli occhi il guardo
 Torcer non so, conosco in lor la luce
 Che ne mostra la via ch' a Dio mi guide.
 E, se nel lume loro acceso io ardo,
 Nel nobil foco mio dolce riluce
 La gioia, che nel cielo eterna ride.

"To the First Perfect, and First Fair."

To Heaven the smile of beauty wins my soul,
That finds on earth no lasting home of rest,
But living, joins the spirits of the blest—
A boon enjoyed by few beneath the pole.
In harmony, the golden moments roll
With him, to whom my ardent thoughts aspire,
Of universal life and grace the Sire ;
Whose presence animates the perfect whole.
Hence, when I dare not turn away mine eyes
From gazing on the "human face divine,"
I know the rays of its immortal light,
On wings of love allure me to the skies,—
My Father's temple ; where his glories shine,
With joy eternal and supreme delight !

Park-Wood.

W. E.

LINES ON A DEW-DROP.

Sparkler! they say that with thy draught
Titania's acorn bowl is fill'd—
The pearl-wine by the fairies quaff'd,
Instead of grapes from gems distill'd.

What art thou like? A wandering drop
Flung from some heavenly waterfall,
Which pass'd its bounds, and did not stop
Until it reach'd our earthly ball.

What art thou like? A precious tear
Dropp'd from some pitying seraph's eye,
Who wept, while hovering o'er our sphere,
The sins he saw beneath the sky.

The Moralist and Bard agree
That mortal glory, gain and power,
Too well, alas, resemble thee,
The dreamy brilliants of an hour.

Yet still, while Truth in vain condemns
The fond pursuit of things so frail,
We chase the false and phantom gems
That, ere we call them ours, exhale.

Such are the gems of this world, given
A moment on its flowers to shine ;
And he, who seeks for those of Heaven,
Must quit the surface for the mine.

Bright monitor! how rich the lore,
The thoughtless heart from thee might learn,
Would man but pause one instant o'er
The kindred drop he hastes to spurn!

OBITUARY.

1823. May 13, at *Norfolk, in Virginia*, SARAH, wife of Mr. Charles BOWRING; and, on the 21st June, Mr. CHARLES BOWRING.

steadiness of popular attachment, when it depends upon the mere manner of a preacher and not upon any distinct theological principle.

July 28th, when on a visit to his son, at *Reading*, the Rev. JAMES HINTON, of Oxford, A. M., after a few hours' illness. He had been long the pastor of the Baptist Congregation at Oxford, which by his respectable talents, amiable manners, and high character, he had raised to a very flourishing condition. For many years he had conducted with reputation and success a Boarding School, at which numbers of the leading persons in his own denomination had received their education. Mr. Hinton was in the management of the Baptist Missionary Society, and was much and deservedly looked up to by his brethren.

Sept. 2, the Rev. THOMAS WINSTANLEY, D. D., Principal of St. Alban's Hall, Camden Professor of Ancient History, and Laudean Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford, and Prebendary of St. Paul's, London.

August 3rd, at *Northallerton*, in his 68th year, after a long and severe illness, which he bore with truly pious resignation and Christian fortitude, Mr. THOMAS MITCHELL, late of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, deeply lamented by a numerous family and an extensive circle of friends. He was a most excellent husband, a kind and indulgent father, and a most cheerful and valuable member of society.

Sept. 2, at *Aston, Warwickshire*, in the 80th year of his age, to the great regret of his friends and his parishioners, the Rev. BENJAMIN SPENCER, LL. D., 52 years Vicar of the above parish; also Rector of Hatton, Lincolnshire, and more than 40 years an active Magistrate for the counties of Warwick and Stafford.

August 19, at *Shefford, Bedfordshire*, in his 57th year, ROBERT BLOOMFIELD, author of the "Farmer's Boy," &c. &c. His constitution, naturally weak, had of late years become alarmingly impaired; every fresh attack left him still weaker; the last, it was feared, had he survived it, would have fixed him in a state of mental aberration, to which himself and dearest friends must have preferred his death.

Sept. 6, after a short illness, aged 70, HANNAH, the wife of John THOMSON, Esq., of Kendal, and mother of the late Dr. Thomson, of Leeds. Hers was a character in which was found a rare assemblage of the best qualities of our nature. The dignified and graceful ease of her manners, whilst it obtained general respect, peculiarly fitted her for receiving and communicating pleasure in the cheerful intercourse of society—but it was in the select circle of her family and friends, that the true worth of her character was seen and felt—here it was that the wisdom of religion rendered her peculiarly instructive, and the benignity of its spirit truly engaging. In what manner she discharged the duties of a wife and mother, the strongest testimony is the grief of her surviving family occasioned by this bereaving providence;—amongst them will be long remembered the sincerity and tenderness of her affection, and the zeal and assiduity with which she laboured to promote their happiness. In her religious character she was particularly eminent. Her piety was cheerful, and yet deeply rooted, and her attendance upon public worship most exemplary. Religion she had considered with care; and holding to the great leading truths of the gospel, she cultivated that genuine charity which respects piety wherever it is found. It is a satisfaction to add, that as she endured affliction with a patience and fortitude which did honour to Christianity, so the glorious promises of this religion, the influence of which she had felt through life, were her comfort and support in death.

Aug. 23, at his apartments, *Trinity Square, Tower Hill*, aged 75, the Rev. THOMAS DAVIES, once a popular minister amongst the Calvinistic Methodists. He was a native of Wales, and possessed much of the characteristic zeal of his countrymen. His preaching was attractive to the common people from his vehemence and oddity, which was not without humour. He occupied for some years the old meeting-house, or as he was accustomed to call it, the old barn, in Bartholomew Close; whence he removed to Queen Street Chapel, Cheapside. His popularity was, we believe, never profitable, and we fear he experienced towards the close of life the un-

Sept. 6th, at Florence, Mr. LAURENCE ROWE, of Brentford, aged 69; a valuable member of the Presbyterian congregation in that town, and an enlightened, zealous and steady friend to truth and liberty, whose loss is deeply and will be long lamented by his respectable family and a large circle of friends.

Sept. 10, after a few days' illness, at his seat, *Gatcombe Park, Gloucestershire*, DAVID RICARDO, Esq., Member of Parliament for Portarlington. The death of this gentleman, in the midst of days and of fame, has occasioned an indescribable shock to his family and friends. An abscess in the ear, a constitutional complaint, which extended to the brain, put an end to his valuable life. He was the head, and in one sense the founder of a large family, who looked up to him with affection and reverence. His sound mind, sterling integrity, nice honour and amiable manners, made him universally respected and beloved. By his talents he had acquired in the money-market a princely fortune, which was gained honourably and used generously. He is known to the English public, and to the literary and scientific men of Europe by his works on Political Economy, which evince an uncommon reach and peculiar acuteness of mind. He was regarded as the leading political economist in the House of Commons, where all parties agreed to shew deference to his opinions. This universal respect is the more decisive of his great mental powers, as he was scarcely eloquent in the Parliamentary sense of the term, and as he maintained political principles to which the majority of the House of Commons are strongly opposed. With extraordinary talents he united great simplicity of character and urbanity of manner, and hence he was every where a favourite. On all great public questions he was with the people, and the reader will turn back with new interest to his admirable speech given in our last number, pp. 490—492, in support of the "Christians' Petition against the Prosecution of Unbelievers,"—a speech the more manly and virtuous on account of the suspicions and opprobrium to which he knew himself to be subject from his origin among the Jewish people.

Sept. 16, in the 43rd year of her age, Mrs. ELIZABETH LUDDINGTON, wife of Mr. William Luddington, of *Euston Square*. She fell a sacrifice to the incessant attention and unremitting vigilance with which she conducted a seminary for young ladies, which under her fostering

wing had attained to an unexampled prosperity. Upon her return after the late midsummer recess to the discharge of professional duties, her indisposition augmented, and alas! terminated in speedy dissolution. To her truly afflicted partner and to her three affectionate daughters, as well as to all her other relatives and friends she had endeared herself by the many excellencies both of her head and of her heart. They will long cherish her memory! Her removal from an extensive sphere of usefulness in the meridian of life and in the zenith of activity, forms an awful comment on the vanity of human expectations, and powerfully inculcates the wisdom of directing our hopes to the imperishable glories of the heavenly world. This account of a beloved sister shall be closed with lines, of which she expressed her warmest admiration a few weeks ago, when she heard them recited by her brother as a specimen of devotional poetry, at the conclusion of a Lecture on the *Belles Lettres* delivered at her seminary:

Yes, we shall live for ever! *Life's* short
years
May bring their destined trials, cares and
joys,
And strew the thorns and roses in our
way:
But we shall follow where the *Mighty*
Lord
Of man's redemption, rising from the
grave
Ascended, pointing to our promised
home
Above, where *spirits of the just* abide
In immortality and perfect love!

This indeed, is the land of shadows, evanescent in its nature, and most transitory in its duration. Substance and permanency are the sole attributes of a superior state of being. "It is congruous to our expectation of so great things after death, that we live in a cheerful, pleasant expectation of it. For what must necessarily intervene, though not grateful in itself, should be reckoned so for the sake of that which is. This only can upon the best terms reconcile us to the grave, that our greatest hopes lie beyond it and are not hazarded by it but accomplished." *This mortal must put on immortality.*

J. EVANS.

Islington, Sept. 20, 1823.

Deaths Abroad.

Lately, M. LAMBRECHTS. We cannot offer a better sketch of the life of M. Lambrechts than that given by himself, which we extract from a small pamphlet, entitled, *Notices found amongst the Pa-*

pers of Count Lambrechts, and published by his heir :—

"I was born on the 20th of November, 1753; I took my Licentiate's degree in 1774; in 1777, I was appointed a Professor of Law in the University of Louvain. After going through the requisite examinations, I obtained the degree of Doctor in 1782. In the years 1788 and 1789, I visited the different universities of Germany. I undertook this mission at the command of Joseph II., who bore the unusual character of a philosopher on the throne. I was enjoined to lecture, after my return, on a subject hitherto neglected at Louvain, viz., the *Laws of Nature and of Nations*. It was principally from the conversation of the professors in the universities I had visited, that I derived my political principles—that I acquired that love of liberty and that hatred of arbitrary power, which will glow in my breast till its last sigh. I consider it the highest privilege that can be enjoyed on earth, to depend on the laws alone, and not on the caprice of man.

"In 1793 I took up my abode at Brussels, to practise in the honourable and independent profession of an advocate. After the conquest of the Belgic Provinces by the French, I was successively a municipal officer in the city of Brussels, Member and President of the administration of the Central and Superior Belgic Provinces, &c.; lastly, on the formation of the Senate I became a member of that body, to which very important functions were intrusted. How many indulge themselves in chimerical visions of happiness in the publicity after which they aspire! I gloried in again becoming a private French citizen, after having thus acted my part on the political stage. In the year 1819, however, two considerable departments, that of the Bas-Rhin and the Seine-Inférieure, elected me as their representative in the Chamber of Deputies. In this they conferred on me the most distinguished honour a Frenchman can receive; and I request them to accept my most heartfelt acknowledgments."

After having related, in these few

words, the principal events of his life, M. Lambrechts concludes this manuscript (the last he wrote) with his religious and political creed. Every feeling of his admirable mind is laid open to the reader, who must behold with the liveliest emotion this virtuous man looking back from the brink of the grave, and giving instructions to his fellow-men worthy the pages of a Fenelon. The sufferings of M. Lambrechts, after a long and painful illness, were terminated on the 3rd of August, 1823; he breathed his last in the arms of M. Charles d'Outrepont, his intimate friend, whom he appointed his residuary legatee. By an article in his will, M. Lambrechts left a large endowment to an institution for blind and sick Protestants. To avoid the appearance of intolerance, he declares that he makes this bequest in favour of Protestants only, because he found that blind persons of that religious persuasion were no longer admitted at *Quinze-Vingts*. He also bequeathed two thousand francs to the *Institute*, requesting that literary body to propose, as a prize-subject, a discourse on *Religious Liberty*, and to present that sum to the author who should be judged worthy of the prize.

M. Lambrechts published, in 1815, a work entitled, *Political Principles*; and, in 1818, he wrote a pamphlet, full of erudition and of just views, in answer to the work of the *Abbé Frayssinous* on the *Concordat*.—*Rev. Encyclop.*

THE celebrated CARNOT has died, after a painful illness, at Magdeburg, where he had taken refuge since 1815. He was one of those men who have done honour to France, and retained, amidst many seductions, his character for honesty and firmness. He was a member of the Executive Directory, and of the Academy of Sciences, and a Lieutenant-General in the French army. He accepted of no conspicuous public employment under the regime of Napoleon till the French territory was invaded. He was born on the 13th of May, 1753.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

Manchester College, York.

THE Thirty-seventh Annual Meeting of the Trustees of this Institution was held in the Cross-Street Chapel Rooms, Manchester, on Friday the 1st of August

last; George William Wood, Esq., in the Chair.

The proceedings of the Committee, since the last Annual Meeting of the Trustees, were read, approved of, and confirmed.

The accounts of the Treasurer were

laid before the Meeting, duly audited by Mr. Joseph Mason and Mr. S. D. Darbshire, and were allowed.

After passing unanimous votes of thanks to the President, Vice-Presidents, Visitors, Committee, and other officers, for their services during the past year, the meeting proceeded to the election of officers for the ensuing year, when the following gentlemen were appointed, viz. Joseph Strutt, Esq., of Derby, President; James Touchet, Esq., of Broomhouse, near Manchester, Peter Martineau, Esq., of St. Albans, Daniel Gaskell, Esq., of Lupsett, near Wakefield, Abraham Crompton, Esq., of Lune Villa, near Lancaster, the Rev. John Yates, of Toxteth Park, near Liverpool, and the Rev. John Kentish, of the Woodlands, near Birmingham, Vice-Presidents; George William Wood, Esq., of Platt, Treasurer; Thomas Robinson, Esq., of Manchester, Chairman of the Committee; Mr. Samuel D. Darbshire and the Rev. John James Tayler, of Manchester, Secretaries; and Mr. Samuel Kay and Mr. Benjamin Heywood, of Manchester, Auditors. The offices of Visitor, Assistant Visitor, and public Examiners, continue to be filled by the Rev. William Turner, of Newcastle, the Rev. Lant Carpenter, LL.D., of Bristol, and the Rev. Joseph Hutton, LL.D., of Leeds, and the Rev. John Gooch Roberts, of Manchester.

The Committee of the last year was re-elected with the exception of Mr. Samuel Allcock, Mr. Benjamin Heywood, and the Rev. Arthur Dean, who are succeeded by Mr. Robert Philips, Jun. of Heath House, and Mr. Matthew Hedley and Mr. John Bentley, of Manchester.

The Deputy Treasurers were also re-elected, with the addition of the Rev. Charles Berry for Leicester and the neighbourhood.

The divinity students in the College during the past session were sixteen in number, fourteen of whom were on the foundation. Of these, Mr. Richard Shawcross and Mr. William Bowen, M. A. have completed their course, and entered upon the duties of their profession as Dissenting ministers. Three of the candidates for admission on the foundation have been received into the College on probation, viz. Mr. Francis Darbshire, son of Mr. Robert Darbshire of Bolton; Mr. Edward Higginson, son of the Rev. Edward Higginson of Derby; and Mr. Francis Rankin, son of Mr. Robert Rankin of Bristol; making the present number of students on the foundation seventeen. It should be stated, however, that the three last-mentioned students are admitted, on a grant of half of the usual exhibition, with the understanding, that

they should have a preference to succeed to full exhibitions, as vacancies occur.

Applications for admission for the Session commencing in September, 1824, accompanied by the requisite testimonials, should be addressed to the Secretaries before the 1st of May next.

From the Treasurer's report of the state of the funds, it appears that the new annual subscriptions for the year, rather exceed, in amount, those which have been discontinued.—The congregational collections have amounted to 137*l.* 16*s.* 6*d.*, the benefactions to 144*l.* 1*s.*, and from Fellowship Funds the Trustees have received 29*l.* 5*s.* Included in these sums the Trustees have the pleasure of noticing a congregational collection from the New Meeting Congregation, Birmingham, by the Rev. John Kentish, being the largest ever made on behalf of the College; a benefaction of 100*l.* from Robert Gawthrop, Esq., of Kendal, and another from Daniel Gaskell, Esq., of Lupsett, of 21*l.*, being his fourth. These sums, which have been received since the York Annual Meeting, and, it is believed, in consequence of the unfavourable report of the state of the funds then made, have reduced the balance due to the Treasurer. The annual expenditure has, notwithstanding, considerably exceeded the income of the year; and the Treasurer, consequently, is in advance to the College, a still larger sum than at the close of the last year. The balance now standing in his favour is upwards of 160*l.*

Under these circumstances the trustees have thought it inexpedient to make the usual addition to the permanent fund to cover the annual allowance for depreciation of the buildings at Manchester and York, as directed by the resolutions of the last Manchester annual meeting. They trust, however, that such an increase will be obtained to the income of the College, from congregational collections and the liberality of individuals, as may enable them in future to carry this object into full effect.

During the last year the expediency of investing the permanent property of the College in the purchase of land, has been frequently brought under the consideration of the committee, and from the attention which they have paid to the question, they are of opinion that, on the whole, such an appropriation of the disposable funds would, at this period, be advantageous to the interests of the institution. In reference to this subject, the following resolutions were passed at this meeting, viz.

Resolved unanimously,

That it appears to this meeting to be very desirable to have the permanent

funds of the College invested in real estates, and that the present is a favourable period for the purchase of land.

That the committee be empowered to make such investment in land on behalf of the permanent fund as they may judge expedient.

The chair was then taken by James Darbishire, Esq., and the thanks of the meeting were unanimously voted to G. W. Wood, Esq., for his services as President.

S. D. DARBISHIRE, } Secretaries.
J. J. TAYLER, }
Manchester, August, 1823.

Opening of Unitarian Chapel, Willington, Cheshire.

Nantwich, Sept. 15, 1823.

ON Tuesday, August 19, a new Chapel was opened for the worship of the Only True God the Father, at the village of Willington, in Cheshire, three miles from Tarporley, and eight from Chester, by the Rev. John Grundy, of Manchester. A congregation of about seventy heard, with great attention, a very interesting and argumentative sermon from Mr. Grundy, from Acts xvii. 20. In this discourse the leading principles of Unitarian Christianity were perspicuously presented to the view of the hearers, and delivered in an unaffected but animated strain of natural eloquence; and there is every reason to believe, that a number who had not been accustomed to the preaching of Unitarian Christians, will in future entertain not only more correct, but also more favourable views of Unitarians and their principles. The friends to the cause who were present dined together to the number of nearly fifty, at an inn at Kelsal, rather more than a mile from the chapel. In the afternoon, the Rev. J. Philp, of Whitchurch, delivered to about the same number of hearers a very judicious view of Unitarian principles, from Mark viii. 29. The hearers were very attentive, and many of them expressed themselves much pleased with what they had heard. In the evening, the Rev. James Hawkes, of Nantwich, addressed a somewhat smaller audience than the two former, from John iv. 21. The preacher endeavoured to impress upon his hearers, consisting principally of the labouring class, not only the acceptableness of the sincere worship of the Father alone, but also the correctness of such worship supported by the Saviour himself in this and in other parts of the gospel, sanctioned by his own example and also by the example of the apostles. The Rev. Mr. Bakewell, of Chester, took the introductory part of

the service in the afternoon. The Rev. Mr. Lyons of Chester, took the head of the table at dinner, and after dinner, moved the thanks of the meeting to Mr. Grundy for his very excellent services, which he eulogized in a very happy and well-merited manner in a short but appropriate address. Several friends from Chester, Nantwich, &c., were present. The collection at the chapel was small, in consequence of there being but few able to contribute much who had not previously contributed handsomely. Mr. Lyons paid Mr. Astbury, the minister of the place, a very handsome compliment for his honourable exertions in the cause of Unitarianism. He has given the ground on which the chapel is built, besides contributing in other respects very liberally towards the accomplishment of the object in which his heart was much interested. J. H.

Commemoration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Rev. S. S. Toms's Ministry, at Framlingham, in Suffolk.

ON Friday, August 22, 1823, a Meeting was held at Framlingham, Suffolk, to celebrate the Fiftieth Anniversary of Mr. S. S. Toms's ministry in that place. At eleven o'clock in the forenoon, a respectable congregation assembled in the Meeting House for divine worship. There were present persons from London, Norwich, Ipswich, Woodbridge, Bury, Diss, Harleston, Laxfield, and other places. Mr. Valentine, of Diss, prayed and read the Scriptures; after which, Mr. W. P. Scargill, of Bury, offered up an appropriate prayer. Mr. J. Perry of Ipswich, delivered a discourse from 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20. The leading topics of the discourse were, the important and extensive duties of the ministerial office, and the high, the honourable, and sure reward connected with a faithful and conscientious discharge of those duties; Mr. W. Clack, of Soham, in Cambridgeshire, concluded with prayer; Mr. T. Cooper, of Newcastle-under-Lyme, read the hymns. At two o'clock, sixty gentlemen sat down to dinner at the Crown Inn, Mr. W. P. Scargill, of Bury, in the chair. As a proof of the esteem in which Mr. Toms is held by all parties, there were present persons of various denominations among the Dissenters, and several members of the Established Church. A large party of ladies dined at the minister's house, and after dinner they were with other persons introduced into the room, where the gentlemen were assembled at the Inn. In the course of the afternoon, several appropriate and

interesting speeches were delivered by Messrs. Scargill, Cooper, Latham, Perry, Clack, Means and others, which were received by the company with marks of strong approbation. The Chairman in giving Mr. Cooper's health, referred to his exertions in the cause of Negro Slavery, which induced Mr. C. to give the company a view of what he saw of the slaves, and of the woeful effects of the slave-system, during his residence in Jamaica, and adverted to the great exertions which are now making by the Abolitionists for their gradual emancipation. He expressed an ardent hope that people in general would read the books which are now in circulation upon the subject of Negro Slavery, in order that they may be prepared to sign petitions to Parliament against it, which they will shortly be called upon to do. The company were much gratified by hearing, that an order had been sent out by the government of this country to lay aside the whip, at least as to the females.

About five o'clock, the elegant present of plate which had been provided by Mr. Toms's congregation and friends to be presented to him on this occasion, as a token of their high regard and esteem for him, was brought into the room. Mr. S. Keer, of Crettingham, presented it to his venerable pastor, and addressed him in a very interesting manner to the following effect: "Rev. Sir, I rise to address you in the name of the church and congregation, as their beloved and highly-esteemed pastor, and to beg your acceptance of this present as a token of that respect and esteem we have for your person, your many virtues, both public and private, your long and useful labours amongst us, and for that bright and worthy example which you have so long set before us. Totally unaccustomed as I am to speak in public, it will not be expected that I should say much before this truly respectable company; but, dear Sir, I sincerely congratulate you upon the pure and refined pleasures of this day which you are spared to enjoy, and upon that respect which you now receive from this numerous assembly. I bless God for all his goodness to you and to us in times past, and pray that you may yet be long spared, to be useful and happy amongst us." Mr. Toms replied in a speech of considerable length, in which he gave a brief view of the rise and constitution of the church at Framlingham; he also mentioned the steps by which he was led to become the pastor, and the motives which have induced him to continue in that situation for such a length of time, and that

he had never felt even a wish to remove.

Mr. Toms added, that he received the present with peculiar satisfaction from his old and much-esteemed friend Mr. S. Keer, who, with another individual at the end of the room, were the only two remaining in the congregation who signed his invitation to Framlingham. The speech seemed deeply to impress the minds of all those who had the pleasure of hearing it, and of witnessing the rapture and enthusiasm with which it was received.

At six o'clock, the company left the inn, and about sixty persons repaired (by invitation) to the minister's house to take tea, and spent the evening very pleasantly together. All who were present seemed much gratified and delighted with the proceedings of the day.

The bells were ringing through the day, a compliment totally unsolicited.

The plate consisted of a handsome tea pot, sugar basin, and cream ewer. The tea pot has the following inscription upon it.

From the Congregation of
Unitarian Christians and Friends

at

Framlingham in Suffolk,

to

The Rev. S. S. Toms.

22nd August,

Anno Domini

1823.

—
This piece of Plate
is presented by them, together with a
Cream Ewer and a Basin,
In commemoration of the Fiftieth Anniversary
of his ministry there;
and

In testimony of their high estimation
of his enlightened liberality of principle,
as well as steady perseverance
in the cause of civil and religious liberty,
and, of their lasting respect for his virtues,
his piety, and uniform integrity.

—
Sussex Unitarian Association.

On Wednesday, the 27th ult., the Annual Meeting of the Sussex Unitarian Association was held at Brighton. A numerous and highly respectable congregation assembled from the surrounding district, in the Unitarian Chapel, New Road, when the religious services of the day were begun by the Rev. W. Stevens, late of the Isle of Wight, reading and offering up prayers. The Rev. R. Aspland then delivered a discourse from Acts xxiv. 14, 15. Mr. Aspland was

earnestly solicited by the congregation, who remained to execute the business of the association, to give his permission for printing the Sermon, which it is presumed would prove highly beneficial not only to the society, but to the cause of Unitarianism generally. It is still hoped that this will be the case. Sixty-five persons, amongst whom were many ladies, dined together at the Gloucester Hotel. Much interesting information was communicated to the meeting by the preacher, respecting the progress of Unitarianism in India, and many animating and eloquent speeches were made in the course of the afternoon. The company separated at an early hour, highly gratified with the proceedings of the day. The following ministers were present, and spoke at the meeting: Rev. R. Aspland, Hackney; J. Fullagar, Chichester; Dr. Morell, J. Donoughue, J. Ketley, and W. Stevens, Brighton; G. Duplock, Ditchling; William Johnston, and T. W. Horsfield, Lewes. Ebenezer Johnston, Esq., of Lewes, was in the chair, to whom the members were much indebted for the ability with which he kept up the life and spirit of the meeting. T. W. H.

New Chapel, Stamford Street, Surrey.

THIS elegant chapel has been erected with the funds granted by the Commissioners for the Improvement of Westminster, as the value of the Presbyterian Chapel in Princes Street, Westminster, which they took down some years ago. The delay in building a new place of worship arose partly from the tardiness of parliamentary and legal forms, and partly from the difficulty of obtaining eligible freehold ground. The new building is for the use of the Westminster congregation, which is represented by the surviving trustees and members. These gentlemen were applied to by the members of the congregation, lately assembling in St. Thomas's, Southwark, for accommodation in the new edifice. This has been granted, and on the recommendation of the St. Thomas's congregation, their former minister, the Rev. Dr. THOMAS REES, has been unanimously appointed by the trustees and members of Princes Street, the minister of the Stamford Street Chapel, which is expected to be opened by him for Unitarian Christian worship on an early Sunday in the month of October, of which due notice will be given. The chapel is under the sanction of a special Act of Parliament, rendered necessary by some defect in the general Westminster Improvement Act.

New Chapel at Hanley.

THE new Chapel at Hanley, Staffordshire, (the Rev. Thomas Cooper, minister,) is expected to be opened on Wednesday, Nov. 19, when two sermons will be preached, that in the morning by the Rev. R. Aspland, of Hackney, and that in the evening by the Rev. James Yates, of Birmingham. There will be a service also on the following (Thursday) evening, when a sermon will be preached by the Rev. J. Grundy, of Manchester. A public dinner will be provided between the services on Wednesday.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Consecration of the Jews' Synagogue.

FRIDAY, August 29, a very interesting scene, as affecting the Hebrew nation, took place at the Great Synagogue, in Jew's-place. Some time since, it was by accident discovered, that the dry rot had found its way into the rafters and supporters of the roof of the Jewish Synagogue. The repairs were of so extensive a nature, that many months have been occupied, and nearly 5,000*l.* expended in performing them. The inside of the Synagogue has been fitted up and beautified in such a style, that it may, in point of splendour, vie with any place of worship in the metropolis; and yesterday was the day appointed for performing the solemn ceremony of its consecration. All the avenues round the Synagogue were crowded with the lower order of the Jew people, whilst the interior of the building contained all the wealthy and powerful members of that persuasion. The galleries were crowded with females, many of whom were very beautiful, and all attired in that fashionable splendour which forms a principal characteristic of the nation. Soon after four o'clock, the hour appointed for the performance of the ceremony, the Chief Rabbi, attended by the Wardens, Elders, and other Officers of the Synagogue, bearing the rolls of the Law, appeared at the doors of the Synagogue; the Chief Rabbi was in his full costume under a canopy of state, supported by six persons; the Wardens and Officers were in their robes and scarfs. The Chief Rabbi then exclaimed, "Open unto us the gates of righteousness; we will enter them and praise the Lord." They then all entered in procession, preceded by six little boys tastefully attired, each carrying a large silver basket filled with different flowers, which they strewed along the path over which the procession passed. In this manner they circumambulated the Synagogue seven times, during which time seven appropriate Psalms were chanted by the

Reader and Choir, the music of which was exceedingly grand. Upon the procession approaching the Ark for the seventh time, the rolls of Laws, which were all secured in peculiar cases, most splendidly ornamented, were severally placed within the Ark. The Chief Rabbi then delivered a prayer on behalf of the whole congregation, in which he particularly noticed the providential discovery of the state of the building. Three of the rolls were then taken from the Ark, and conveyed in procession to an elevated spot in the centre of the Synagogue, when the Reader, surrounded by all the Officers, delivered in a very solemn manner, in the Hebrew language, the following prayer for the King and the Royal Family :—

"He who disposeth salvation unto kings and dominions unto princes, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, who delivered his servant David from the destructive sword, who maketh a way in the sea and a path through the mighty wilderness, may He bless, preserve, guard, assist, exalt, and highly aggrandize, our Sovereign Lord King George the Fourth and all the Royal Family. May the Supreme King of kings, through his infinite mercy, grant them life, preserve and deliver them from all manner of trouble, sorrow and danger. Subdue the nations under the soles of the king's feet, cause his enemies to fall before him, and grant him to reign prosperously. May the Supreme King of kings, through his infinite mercy, inspire him and his Counsellors and Nobles with benevolence towards us and all Israel. In his days and in ours may Judah be saved and Israel dwell in safety, and may the Redeemer come unto Zion, which God, in his infinite mercy, grant, and we will say—Amen."

The rolls of the Law being replaced in the Ark, and some other peculiar forms of service having been gone through, a

subscription was opened towards defraying the expenses of the building, and in a very short time near 1000*l.* was collected. The mode of conducting the subscription was a most curious one; for the Sabbath having just commenced as the subscription was opened, no money or cheques passed, and every moment one might see the officers who were collecting the names of the subscribers hold up their fingers to any friends whom they saw at a distance, which was to ask him how much he meant to subscribe. As many fingers as the individual held up in return he was immediately put down for so many guineas. The subscriptions were afterwards announced in Hebrew; after this was over, the ordinary forms of the Sabbath eve commenced —*Courier*.

THE Roman Catholic Church has lately lost her Pope, Pius VII., at the advanced age of 81, or as some reports state, 83. His name was Chiaramonti. He had been a Benedictine monk, and rose to the chair of theology at Rome, then successively to the bishoprics of Tivoli and Imola, afterwards to the rank of Cardinal, and lastly, in 1800, two years after the death of Pius VI., to the Holy See. His private character seems to have been universally respected. While he was Bishop of Imola, he addressed, under the name of "Citizen Chiaramonti," a "Homily" to the people of his diocese, in favour of republicanism, extracts from which are given in a former volume (XV. 693, 694). In the reign of Bonaparte he was a mere cipher, when he was not made a tool. The Catholics have been busy in the pageantry of masses for the deceased old gentleman, and the cardinals are in conclave at Rome to elect a successor, who will in all likelihood be the creature of Austria, whose influence is unhappily predominant in Italy.

NEW PUBLICATIONS IN THEOLOGY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Holy Bible, with Notes, Explanatory and Critical, and Practical Reflections. Designed principally for the Use of Families. By the Rev. C. Well-beloved. 4to. Part III. (Containing the Book of Numbers.) 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Saxon Chronicles, with an English Translation, and Notes, Critical and Explanatory. By the Rev. J. Ingram, late Saxon Professor in the University of Oxford. To which are added, a New and

Copious Chronological, Topographical and Glossarial Index, with a Short Grammar of the Saxon Language. 4to. With an accurate and enlarged Map of England during the Heptarchy, Plates of Coins, &c. 3*l.* 13*s.* 6*d.* boards.

Report on the present State of the Greek Confederation, and on its Claims to the Support of the Christian World. Read to the Greek Committee, Sept. 13, 1823. By Edward Blaquiére, Esq. 1*s.* 6*d.*

An Examination of the Hypothesis advanced in a recent Publication entitled *Palæoromaica*; proving, in opposition thereto, that the Text of the Elzevir Edition of the Greek Testament is not a Translation from the Latin; and vindicating the Originality of that Text which is preserved in the Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament, and in the Writings of the Greek Fathers collectively. By W. G. Broughton, M. A., Curate of Hartley Wespall, Hants.

An Inquiry into the Accordancy of War with the Principles of Christianity, and an Examination of the Philosophical Reasoning by which it is defended: with Observations on some of the Causes of War, and on some of its Effects. 8vo. 5s.

A History of Richmondshire, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, together with those parts of Everwickshire, of Domesday, which forms the Wapentakes of Lonsdale, Ewecross and Amunderness, in the Counties of York, Lancaster and Westmoreland. By T. D. Whittaker, LL.D. F. S. A. 2 Vols. Folio. 25l. 4s. Large Paper, 50l. 8s.

Substance of the Debate in the House of Commons, May 15, 1823, on a Motion for the Mitigation and gradual Abolition of Slavery, throughout the British Dominions: with a Preface and Appendixes, containing Facts and Reasonings illustrative of Colonial Bondage. 5s.

A Letter on the Means and Importance of Converting the Slaves in the West Indies to Christianity. By the Right Hon. Sir G. H. Rose, M. P. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A Voice from Jamaica, in Reply to Wm. Wilberforce, Esq., M. P. By G. W. Bridges, of Trinity College, Oxford, and Rector of the Parish of Manchester, Jamaica. 8vo. 2s.

Chemical Essays, on a variety of Subjects, principally relating to the Manufactures of the British Dominions. By Samuel Parkes, F. L. S. M. R. I. &c. 2nd. edition. Enlarged, and for the most part re-written. 2 Vols. 8vo. With Table of Chemical Equivalents, and 24 Engravings. 1l. 14s.

A Grammar of the Three Principal Oriental Languages, Hindoostanee, Persian and Arabic, on a Plan entirely new and perfectly easy: to which is added, a Set of Persian Dialogues, composed for the Author, by Merza Mohammed Saulih, of Shiraz, accompanied with an English Translation. By William Price, Esq. 4to. 1l. 1s.

A Dissertation on the Age of Homer, his Writings and Genius; and on the State of Religion, Society, Learning and the Arts, during that Period: being the Prize Question, proposed by the Royal Society of Literature for His Majesty's

Premium of One Hundred Guineas for the Best Dissertation on the above Subject. 2s. 6d.

Israel Lyon's Hebrew Grammar, with Points. Revised and Corrected by H. Jacobs. 4th edition. 5s.

Flora Scotica; or, a Description of Scottish Plants, arranged both according to the Artificial and Natural Methods. In Two Parts. By Wm. Jackson Hooker, LL.D. F. R. A. and L. S. 8vo. 14s.

Sylva Florifera, the Shrubbery: containing an Historical and Botanical Account of the Flowering Shrubs and Trees which now Ornament the Shrubbery, the Park and Rural Scenes in general; with Observations on the Formation of Ornamental Plantations and Picturesque Scenery. By Henry Phillips, F. H. S. 2 Vols. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

A Treatise on Mental Derangement. By Francis Willis, M. D., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Musæ Solitariae, a Collection of Original Melodies, adapted to various Measures of Psalms and Hymns, with Words at Length, and a Full Accompaniment for the Piano Forte or Organ. By Joseph Jowett, Rector of Silk Willoughby. 4to. 12s.

The Works of John Playfair, Esq., late Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh, &c. With a Memoir of the Author. 4 Vols. 8vo. 2l. 12s. 6d.

Recollections of the Peninsula, containing Sketches of the Manners and Character of the Spanish Nation. By the Author of Sketches of India. 8vo. 8s.

Travels in various Countries of the East, more particularly Persia. By Sir W. Ouseley. 4to. Vol. III. 3l. 13s. 6d.

Travels, comprising Observations made during a Residence in the Tarentaise, and various Parts of the Grecian and Pennine Alps, in Savoy, and in Switzerland and Auvergne, in the Years 1820, 1821 and 1822, with Remarks on the Present State of Society, Manners, Religion, Agriculture, Climate, &c., of those Countries. By Robert Bakewell, Esq. 2 Vols. 8vo. Plates and Wood-Cuts. 1l. 6s.

A Short Account of some of the Principal Hospitals of France, Italy, Switzerland and the Netherlands, with Remarks upon the Climate and Diseases of those Countries. By H. W. Carter, M. D. F. R. S. E., one of Dr. Radcliffe's Travelling Fellows from the University of Oxford. 8vo. 8s.

Sketches of the Lives of Corregio and Parmegiano. With Notices of their Principal Works. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Remarks on the Country extending from Cape Palmas to the River Congo,

including Observations on the Manners and Customs of the Inhabitants; with an Appendix containing an Account of the European Trade with the West Coast of Africa. By Capt. John Adams. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Fonthill and its Abbey Delineated. By John Rutter.

The Memoirs of the Marchioness de Bonchamps, on La Vendee. Edited by the Countess of Genlis. Translated from the French. 5s.

The Bibliotheca Americana; being a Miscellaneous Collection of Literature, Science and Art, and general South American History. Vol. I. 8vo. Embellished.

The Annual Biography and Obituary for the Year 1823. 8vo. 15s.

Memoirs of Mr. Coxe Feary, First Pastor of the Baptist Church, Bluntisham. By J. Audley.

The Life of Sir Thomas Craig, of Riccartoun, with Biographical Sketches of his most eminent legal Contemporaries. By P. F. Tytler, Esq. Advocate. F. R. and A. S. S.

A Journey from Riga to the Crimea, by way of Kiev; with some account of the Colonization, and of the Manners and Customs of the Colonists of New Russia: to which is added a 2nd edition of Notes relating to the Crim Tartars. By Mary Holderness. 8vo. Coloured plates of Costumes. 10s. 6d.

Information and Directions for Travellers on the Continent. By Mariana Starke. 8vo. 17. 5s.

Remarks on Spain: descriptive of the Manners and Customs of its Inhabitants, Constitutional Troops, Party Feelings, present State of Trade, &c. By John Bramsen, Author of Travels in Egypt, Syria and Greece, &c. 8vo.

A Zodaical Chart, or Orrery of Nature; exhibiting all the Constellations of the Zodiac, with their Stars, from the First to the Seventh Magnitudes, &c. By T. Stackhouse, Lecturer on Astronomy. 12s., in a Case.

The Antiquities of Freemasonry; comprising illustrations of the Five Grand Periods of Masonry, from the Creation of the World to the Dedication of King Solomon's Temple. By George Oliver, Vicar of Clee, in the county of Lincoln. 8vo. Maps. 12s.

Hortus Cantabrigiensis; or an Accented Catalogue of Plants, indigenous and exotic, cultivated in the Cambridge Botanic Garden. By the late James Donn, Curator. 10th edition, with numerous Corrections and Additions, by John Lindley, F. L. S. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The First Part of Vol. XIV. of the Transactions of the Linnean Society of London. 17. 1s.

A New Grammar of the English Language, including the Fundamental Principles of Etymology, Syntax and Prosody. By T. O. Churchill. 12mo. 5s. bound.

A Second Series of Letters to W. Wilberforce, Esq. M. P. and his Defender, Melancthon, on the Claims of the Roman Catholics. By Amicus Protestans. 5s. 6d.

The Spirit of the Union; or, a Narrative of the Treatment received from the United Secession Church Courts, by the Congregation of Queen Ann's Street, Dunfermline, in their late attempt to elect a Minister. 1s. 3d.

A Consideration of the Second Woe Trumpet about to end, and of the Third Woe Trumpet that will quickly follow, which threaten speedily to involve Europe in Civil and Religious Commotion, and to invoke the seven wrathful Plagues of God. By Samuel Toovey. 8vo. 1s.

Correspondence and Communications addressed to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, concerning the Introduction of Tread-Mills into Prisons, with other matters connected with the Subject of Prison Discipline. By Sir J. Cox Hippisley, Bart. &c. 8vo. Plate. 7s.

Cat O'Nine Tails; Vol I. By the Rev. J. Dennis, B. C. L. Prebendary of the Collegiate Church of the Castle of Exeter. 6s.

Essays relative to the Habits, Character and Moral Improvement of the Hindoos, which have originally appeared in the Friend of India. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A Guide to Elocution. By Wm. Roberts, Teacher of Elocution, Edinburgh. 8vo. 7s.

On the Sentient Faculty, and Principles of Human Magnetism. Translated from the French of Count de Redern, and elucidated with Notes, by Francis Corboux, Esq., of Winchelsea. 8vo. 7s.

My Note Book for 1822; or, The Agricultural Question: A Satirical Poem. By Wilfred Woodfall, Esq. Author of "My Note Book." 12mo. 6s.

The Mise of Lewes; or, The Restoration of Magna Charta: a Drama in Five Acts. 2s. 6d.

Australasia. A Poem, written for the Chancellor's Medal at the Cambridge Commencement, July 1823. By W. C. Wentworth, an Australasian. 8vo. 2s.

Popular Tales and Romances of the Northern Nations. 3 vols. Post 8vo. 17. 4s. 6d.

The Fire-Eater. 12mo. 8s.

Translations into Italian of some of the finest Specimens of the British Poets, with the English on one side and the Italian on the Corresponding Page, including The Siege of Corinth, by Lord

Byron. By Abate Domenico Gregori, Professor of the Belles Lettres in Rome. 2 vols. 18mo. 7s.

The Duke of Mercia, an Historical Drama. The Lamentation of Ireland, and other Poems. By Sir Aubrey De Vere Hunt, Bart. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Translations from Claudian. By the Hon. and Rev. Henry Howard. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Poems on Scripture Subjects; "The Offering of Isaac;" "Elijah" (2nd ed.); "The Famine of Samaria," &c. By Mrs. W. C. Bousfield. 6s. 6d.

Gethsemane, a Poem; Founded on the Messiah of Klopstock. By the Authoress of "The Enchanted Plants," &c. 2 vols. Small 8vo. 8s.

The Christian Armed against Infidelity for the Defence of all Denominations of Believers. By the Author of "Body and Soul." 12mo. 5s.

A Dissertation on the Fall of Man, in which the Literal Sense of the Mosaic Account of that Event is asserted and vindicated. By the Rev. G. Holden, M.A. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A Sketch of the Life of the Rev. Jules Charles Rieu, Pastor of the Reformed Church, Fredericia, in Denmark; containing an Account of that Colony. An Engraving. 18mo. 1s. 6d.

Memoirs of Wm. Stevens, Esq., Treasurer of Queen Anne's Bounty. By the Hon. Sir James Allan Park, one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas. 3rd edition. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

Sermons.

Discourses on Various Subjects, and Charges delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Winchester. To which are added several never before published: with Advice to an Unmarried Lady. By Thomas Balcuy, D.D. Archdeacon and Prebendary of Winchester. Edited by the Rev. James Drake, M.A. Chancellor of St. Asaph's, &c. 2 vols. 8vo. 12s.

On Various Subjects. By John Styles, D.D. Vol. II. 12s. 6d.

Parochial Instruction; or, Sermons delivered from the Pulpit, at different Times, in the Course of Thirty Years. By James Bean, M.A. one of the Li-

brarians of the British Museum, and Assistant Minister of Welbeck Chapel, St. Mary-le-bone. 2nd ed. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

A Country Parson's Third Offering to His Mother Church; in Nine Pastoral Sermons. 4s. (The First and Second Offerings, 3s. each.)

Single.

The Kingdom of God. Delivered before the Devon and Cornwall Unitarian Association at Tavistock, July 2nd, 1823. By J. Johns. 8vo.

Christ's Presence a Source of Consolation and Courage: preached on Trinity Monday, May 26, 1823, before the Corporation of the Trinity House, in St. Nicholas' Church, Deptford. By the Very Rev. T. Calvert, B.D. Warden of Manchester and Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. 4to. 1s. 6d.

A Sermon, shewing that genuine Faith is necessarily influential upon the Heart and Life: preached in the Parish Church of Holy Rhood, Southampton. By Robert Oakman, A.B. [Published in consequence of his Ejection from the Curacy, with an Appeal to the Rector to state the Cause.]

The Missionary's Farewell; preached in Port of Spain, Trinidad, by Thomas Adam, late Missionary in that Island. 1s.

The Duty of Searching the Scriptures; preached before the Society for propagating Christian Knowledge, at their Anniversary Meeting in the High Church, Edinburgh, June 5; by the Rev. Robert Gordon, Minister of the Chapel of Ease, St. Cuthberts. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Preached in Highgate Chapel, on Sunday, June 15, 1823, for the Female Charity School, and published at the request of the Trustees, for the Benefit of that Institution. By Johnson Grant, M.A. 1s. 6d.

Preached in the Parish Church, Newark, on Friday, April 25, at the Visitation of the Venerable the Archdeacon of Nottingham. By the Rev. John Bayley, M.A. late Fellow of Emanuel College, Cambridge. 2nd edition. 1s. 6d.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Dr. J. Jones; and Messrs. Buckingham; Hutton (Birmingham); R. Wright; T. Coneys; R. V. Yates; and H. Taylor:—Also from Democritus; Νεύτης; Clericus; Explorator; Amicus; J. F.

We have received also the copy of the Inscription on Mrs. Cappe's tomb, and two articles of Review.

C. will perceive by looking at our notices to correspondents for July, p. 432, that he has been anticipated.

R. M. Y.'s letters were communicated to the Secretary of the Unitarian Fund, and owing to that circumstance were forgotten in the acknowledgments to Correspondents.